

APPENDICES

A	Public Participation Guidelines.....	A-1 to 13
B	Data Elements	B-1 to 7
C	Budget Guidelines for Corridor Planning	C-1 to 2
D	Example of Alternatives Screening Process	D-1
E	List of Agencies	E-1 to 5
F	Reference Materials	F-1 to 3

GLOSSARY

Glossary of Terms.....	Glossary-1 to 4
-------------------------------	------------------------

Public Participation Guidelines

A key ingredient to successfully develop corridor plans is the use of a collaborative process that encourages stakeholders to participate in the plan's formation and, ultimately, conclusion. For public participation to really work, the collaborative process should include:

- A proactive approach—Those who will actually develop the plan must make a concerted effort to develop a public participation strategy that stimulates information exchange.
- Active recruitment of all groups and individuals with a stake in the outcome of the process. Excluded groups often challenge the results and can cause delays in plan approval. In addition, special efforts should be made to reach groups that are traditionally under-represented in the planning process (i.e., low income, disabled persons, minorities) to make sure they are fairly represented and included.
- Respect for all points of view—The public involvement process must encourage open and equal access for the full range of public values.
- Input from all parties—Participants should walk away believing their input matters and adds value to the plan's preparation.
- Progress toward achieving results—Discussion should lead towards action in the plan's progress.
- Collaborative process throughout—All parties are brought together to identify issues, problems, and needs.
- Integrate public involvement activities—Public involvement is not conducted as a stand alone side bar to the study. Rather, outreach activities are scheduled at technical milestones, providing key information and obtaining feedback from the public prior to moving on to the next step. Involve participants in more than a review-and-comment role.
- Interaction among stakeholders as an approach to problem solving—Solutions to thorny problems are best handled as a community effort.
- Multiple representatives of community/project area—No one group should dominate the planning process.
- Reasonably accessible for participants in terms of time of day and location—Make it user friendly; public involvement happens best when people are able to participate!
- Incremental decision making process—Plans are more likely to have community support if the public has been part of the plan's decision making from the outset.
- A defined process by which final decisions are made—All participants clearly understand how the process will work and what the limits are.

A critical factor to keep in mind is that — No one group has all the answers! Using a collaborative process will help assure that the corridor plan being created achieves widespread acceptance, as well as on-the-ground practicality.

Americans With Disabilities Act

Use an accessibility checklist as a guide when making room arrangements. All public participation activities need to comply with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Not only must opportunities be provided, but they must be accessible for all segments of the population wishing to participate in the corridor planning process, including individuals with hearing, vision, or mobility limitations.

Accessibility means:

- **Accessible location:** Visit the site and determine primary entrances for widths and steps; circulation space for wheelchairs; adjustable microphones; amplification system to aid hearing; drinking fountains, rest rooms, public telephones at wheelchair height, accessibility by public transit; parking for persons with disabilities; signing for accessible route to room.
- **Accessible materials and services:** Notices in alternative formats for deaf, hard of hearing, blind, and visually impaired persons; availability of materials in large print, audio cassette, Braille, computer disk; and availability of sign language interpreters, if requested.

Types of Involvement

Public involvement comes in many forms. Typically involvement comes from: outreach, data-gathering, and participation. These broad categories can often overlap, with the understanding that their application to the planning process varies according to the timing during which they are used.

Outreach. Useful for informing people about a topic or issue, this type of participation includes but is not limited to personal contact, media, field offices or drop in centers, citizen boards, and speaker bureaus. The outreach can be two-way, such as open discussions at a drop-in center. One-way delivery of information can also be used, such as bill-stuffers or news releases, or one-way receiving information such as a telephone comment line.

Data-gathering. Techniques used in this category are important for plan development. Examples of data-gathering participation methods are questionnaires, individual interviews, advisory committees, and surveys.

Participation. Methods appropriate for getting citizen involvement on a larger scale include community meetings, open houses, workshops, retreats, conferences, and open forum hearings.

Keep in mind that special techniques may also be appropriate for stimulating more participation. The public has grown very used to certain types of public involvement techniques, possibly to the point of boredom. Introducing new or unusual public involvement techniques will help keep the process interesting and, hopefully, the ideas flowing. A sampling of such techniques are as follows:

- Sponsorships of special events
 - Transportation fairs
 - Games
 - Contests
- Changing a meeting approach
 - Role playing
 - Site visits
 - Non-traditional meeting places and events
- Finding new ways to communicate

- Interactive television and video displays
- Kiosks
- Computer presentations and simulations
- Teleconferencing

It is often effective to piggy back plan-related activities with ongoing community activities such as meetings of community groups, other organization newsletters, school activities, and so on.

Whatever techniques are implemented, take time at the end of the public involvement process to ask participants two key questions: what were some of the things they liked about the technique(s), and what were some things that can be done better next time. This will help keep the process relevant and useful for all participants.

Tool Box of Methods

The tables at the end of this appendix display a variety of public participation techniques that are appropriate for use at various stages of corridor plan development. They are grouped under the categories of **Outreach**, **Data-Gathering**, and **Participation**.

Outreach techniques are particularly appropriate for use both during the early steps in the process and as a way to keep the public informed while the plan is formulated. Techniques listed in the Table under the category of Outreach are appropriate to use during Steps 1, 3, 6, and 7 (i.e., contact with elected officials and/or key stakeholders) and Steps 5, 6, 7, and 8 (publicizing public events and providing access to plan information).

Data-gathering techniques allow planners to obtain information from the public at large or selected groups (stakeholders, elected officials, specific focus groups,

and so on). Surveys are the primary method used to gather the data, and the cost for performing the techniques varies greatly according to the level of distribution and tools used to administer the survey (newspaper insert versus visual preference testing, for example). Steps 6 and 7, when alternatives are considered and analyzed, can benefit by implementing data gathering techniques to collect public opinion.

Participation methods describe the meeting formats most useful for obtaining various types of input. These include smaller groups such as steering committees and technical committees, which are often very useful to use throughout a planning process as a way to touch base with constituents. Full-scale open houses and brainstorming sessions are also excellent methods to gather information. Steps 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 call for meetings with the general public or stakeholders, and the methods listed in the Outreach Table offer ideas about meeting structures to use for getting stakeholders and the public involved in the plan's development.

General information has been provided for each method that indicates in a generic sense how costly the method would be to implement, the length of time needed, the ease with which it can be implemented, the corridor location where the method would be effective, and a brief description of the purpose for using the method. These factors can vary, depending upon the corridor size and complexity. The information in the table provides a reference point about each method's typical traits.

Contact ITD's Public Involvement Coordinator for assistance with developing suitable public participation

programs for the corridors being considered.

For more information about public involvement techniques, see the following publications and references:

Public Involvement Techniques for Transportation Decision Making, U.S. Department of Transportation-Federal Highway Administration & Federal Transit Administration, September 1996. (Numerous techniques are highlighted by type: outreach and organization, meetings, feedback, and special techniques.)

Working Together on Transportation Planning: A Manual for Collaborative Decision Making, Marcelle E. DuPraw & William R. Potapchuk, Program for Community Problem Solving, 1994. (This publication is full of other references.) Program for Community Problem Solving is part of the National Civic League, which has a website at <http://www.ncl.org>. (The website has a link to a list of publications that relate to its interests in community building.)

How Do You Collect and Use Public Information in the Development of Transportation Plans and Programs? Matthew Lindstrom & Martin Nie, Research Consultants for the Arizona Department of Transportation in cooperation with USDOT, FHWA (Report Number: FHWA-AZ97-452), March 1997.

Innovations in Public Involvement for Transportation Planning. Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration of U.S. Department of Transportation, with Howard/Stein-Hudson, Consultant. FHA and FTA.htm at www.pin.org. (Provides additional references of sources that have used the 14 techniques highlighted.)

Washington Interactive Television. Washington State Department of Information Services. TechCentral @www.wa.gov (Information on reaching large numbers of people that are geographically dispersed.)

The Public Meeting Survival Guide. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. P.O. Box 59, Portland, OR 97207. (Practical, easy-to-read text on avoiding pitfalls of putting on public meetings.)

Public Involvement Strategies: A Manager's Handbook. American Water Works Association. 6666 West Quincy Ave., Denver, CO 80235. 1995. (Written for water utility managers, the handbook describes steps and techniques to use to go through public involvement process.)

Citizen Participation: Whose Vision is it? Bill Klein, AICP. APA. 122 S. Michigan Ave., Suite 1600, Chicago, IL 60603 or bklien@planning.org. (A 12-page paper discussing the need for public participation and various techniques.)

Public Outreach Handbook for Departments of Transportation, National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 364, Transportation Research Board, National Academy Press 1994.

The Survey Method

Step 1: Begin with a Proposal

STATE the proposal as "It is proposed that . . ." ASK if everyone understands the proposal. AVOID letting "clarification" slip into advocacy for any point of view at this time.

Step 2: Survey

When everyone is clear on the proposal, ASK "Do you agree, disagree, or are you undecided?" If all agree, you are finished and ready for the next agenda item. If not . . .

Step 3: Poll the Undecided

ASK those who were undecided "What questions do you need to have answered before you can decide yes or no?" As people get their answers to these questions, ask again for their position —agree or disagree.

Step 4: Poll the Minority Option

ASK "What leads you to this position?" Probe with questions and active listening responses. Avoid quick arguments.

Reasons to Explore the Minority Opinion:

- The minority may have valuable previously unexamined information that would cause the majority to change their decision.
- The minority can change their position by realizing as they talk through their information that they don't have adequate evidence for their position.
- The minority can identify specific misinformation that is influencing them and get more accurate data.
- The minority can identify one or more valid counter arguments or concerns which the majority must weigh and use to modify their proposal.
- The minority can better support the decision if they have been heard.

Step 5: Return to the Majority

The majority may discuss the minority position or give counter positions. Limit this test and challenge time and watch that the energy doesn't turn too negative.

Step 6: Re-survey for a Decision

At this point, you can normally be assured that all dissenting information has been heard.

What Can Happen in the Process?

- No party has enough information to resolve and decide, and the decision must be postponed while information is gathered.

- Problems can become more clearly defined and alternatives are examined.
- Common goals are clearly identified and modifications are made to satisfy all concerns.

What to do if a Group Appears Stuck?

The following questions can be used to move a group forward:

- Under what conditions could you support the majority position?
- If we adopted the majority decision, what's the "worst case scenario" you can imagine?
- How could the majority decision be modified into an acceptable action plan?
- Would you be willing to support the majority decision on an "experimental basis" and then bring it up for debate again at an agreed-upon date?

Consensus Decision Making

Definition

Consensus represents a group decision in which there is enough solidarity in sentiment and belief to represent that general accord and agreement have been reached by all parties.

Consensus represents a level of commitment and trust reached by all parties having been heard on an issue.

Commitment is needed to assure the willingness to take the time necessary to reach a mutually acceptable solution.

Description

A consensus decision can be described by the minority opinion in the following way:

"I understand what most of you would like to do. I personally would not do that, but I feel that you understand what my alternative would be. I have had a reasonable opportunity to sway you to my point of view, but clearly have not been able to do so. Therefore, I will support and stand behind what the group desires."

Consensus is distinct from unanimous agreement, voting, majority rules, compromise, or coercion.

How to Give Effective Community Presentations

An effective public affairs program requires an ongoing relationship with the communities directly affected. Presentation can be one of the most effective methods of conveying your messages and addressing community issues. Here are some ways to make your community presentation interesting and effective:

1. **Know your audience.** Understand who they are and what their concerns are. What matters to a group of seniors will be different from what matters to a PTA group. This will require some research and will determine everything about how you prepare the presentation.
2. **Customize your materials to suit your audience.** Some audiences respond better to a slide show, others to charts and graphs.
3. **Time is of the essence.** Keep your presentation as short as possible and never, never, never go over your allotted time.
4. **Avoid being too technical.** Keep in mind that in most cases, you're much closer to the issue than they are. Your presentation is likely being done to familiarize and educate a group on issues that most directly affect them. Save the more technical explanations for one-on-one meetings, and avoid acronyms!
5. **Leave it to the experts.** Once you've determined what is going to be presented, make sure it is going to be presented by a credible source.
6. **Prepare an outline.** Your points are most effective if made in an orderly fashion. Good outlines keep you from skipping important points and prevent rambling presentations.
7. **Practice, practice, practice.** Schedule a practice run at least two days before the presentation. This will leave enough time for any changes or adjustments that may need to be made. All people involved in the presentation should participate.
8. **Be flexible.** Sometimes the audience wants more or something other than what you've prepared. Go with the flow.
9. **Anticipate questions.** Start by writing out a list of questions you're likely to be asked, then ask others to help you practice. Make sure you know the answers. If you don't know the answer, be honest, but get back with an answer ASAP.
10. **Don't let all of your preparation go to waste.** Make sure that you have the equipment necessary to present your materials. Be sure you bring and test overhead projectors, VCRs, outlets, easels, extra light bulbs, and batteries if they aren't going to be provided.
11. **Leave them with something they can reference.** Bring handouts of material presented and contacts for further information.


























Follow up while the issue is still fresh in their minds. Be certain that any requests for additional information or contacts are immediately returned following the presentation.









OUTREACH

Methods	Purpose	Cost	Time	Ease	Location
Bill stuffers	Notify public about coming events	\$	🕒	π	E
Door hangers	Notify public about coming events	\$	🕒	π	U
Use of existing publications	Distribute information to existing readership list	\$	🕒	π	E
Public service announcements	Notify public about meetings, workshops, etc.	\$	🕒	π	E
Legal ads	Comply with legal requirements for legal notification	\$	🕒	π	E
News releases	Generate news coverage of events, stimulate interest	\$	🕒	π	E
Open door policy	Permit walk-in visits to planning office	\$	🕒🕒	👉	E
Meeting with elected officials	Acquire understanding about local perceptions, attitudes	\$	🕒🕒	π	E
Key stakeholder interviews in region	Identify local issues and opinions	\$	🕒🕒 - 🕒🕒🕒	👉	E
Networking/community organizations	Use existing groups to distribute information	\$	🕒🕒	👉	E
Door to door canvassing	Personal contact with those most affected by corridor	\$	🕒🕒🕒	👉	U
Newspaper advertisements	Notify public about meetings, workshops, etc.	\$\$	🕒	π	E
Fact sheets	Handouts for public and used for media	\$\$	🕒🕒	π	E
Briefing book	In-house guide for answering questions	\$\$	🕒🕒	π	E
Toll free telephone hotlines	Quick response for public questions about corridor plan	\$\$	🕒🕒	👉	E
Internet link to ITD	Provide corridor plan information and background	\$\$	🕒🕒	👉	E
Newsletters	Provide updates on planning process, status	\$\$\$	🕒🕒	👉	E
Traveling displays	Set up in highly visible locations to inform public about plan	\$\$\$	🕒🕒🕒	👉	U
Ombudsman	Liaison between public and planning team	\$\$\$	🕒🕒🕒	📖	R
Citizen advisory board	Provide forum for sharing information and exchanging ideas	\$\$\$	🕒🕒🕒	👉	E
Drop-in center	Visible and interactive method for sharing information	\$\$\$\$	🕒🕒🕒	👉	U
Media/public information campaigns	Stimulate interest about corridor planning process	\$ - \$\$\$\$	🕒🕒🕒	👉	E

Legend	
Cost:	
Least Expensive	\$
Most Expensive	\$\$\$\$
Time:	
8 hours or less	🕒
9 to 40 hours	🕒🕒
Over 40 hours	🕒🕒🕒
Ease of Implementation	
Easy	π
Moderate	👉
Difficult	📖
Location of Use:	
Rural	R
Urban	U
Either rural or urban	E

DATA GATHERING

Methods	Purpose	Cost	Time	Ease	Location
Speakers' bureau	Inform groups about plan status and answer questions	\$	 		U
Staff panel discussions	Provide information at forums and solicit input	\$	 	π	U
Interactive cable television/radio	Share information, solicit public input, answer questions	\$	 		E
Direct mail surveys	Obtain information and opinions	\$\$	 	π	E
Telephone surveys	Obtain information and opinions; high rate of response	\$\$\$	 	π	E
Focus groups	Identify issues or expand understanding of issues previously identified	\$\$\$	 		U
Personal surveys	Obtain information from representative sample group	\$\$\$\$	 		U
Visual preference testing	Gain understanding about local preferences	\$ - \$\$\$	  		E
Newspaper survey	Solicit public input	\$\$ - \$\$\$	 		E

Legend	
Cost:	
Least Expensive	\$
Most Expensive	\$\$\$\$
Time:	
8 hours or less	
9 to 40 hours	 
Over 40 hours	  
Ease of Implementation	
Easy	π
Moderate	
Difficult	
Location of Use:	
Rural	R
Urban	U
Either rural or urban	E

PARTICIPATION

Participation Methods	Purpose	Cost	Time	Ease	Location
Citizen representation on boards	Obtain citizen input on key boards	\$	🕒	π	E
Public hearings	Formal public comment	\$	🕒	👓	E
Technical group meetings	Facilitate discussion and provide expert advice	\$	🕒🕒	π	E
Workshops	Exchange information and ideas	\$\$	🕒🕒 - 🕒🕒🕒	👓	U
Facilitated meetings	Facilitate group discussion	\$\$	🕒🕒	π	E
Visioning sessions	General goal-setting for planning and policies	\$\$	🕒🕒🕒	👓	E
Steering committees	Direct plan development and activities	\$\$	🕒🕒	👓	E
Group brainstorming sessions	Focus on specific plan aspects; problem solving	\$\$	🕒🕒	👓	E
Small group meetings	Present information, receive feedback	\$\$	🕒🕒	👓	E
Charettes	Problem-solving for focused issues	\$\$\$	🕒🕒🕒	📖	U
Open houses	Onsite observation of material; obtain feedback	\$\$\$	🕒🕒🕒	👓	U
Teleconferencing	Information exchange and coordination	\$\$\$	🕒🕒	📖	R
Large group meetings	Present information, receive feedback	\$\$\$	🕒🕒🕒	📖	E
Task Forces (Collaborative)	Problem-solving for particular issues	\$\$\$\$	🕒🕒🕒	📖	E
Decision-making techniques	Assist with key plan decisions	\$\$\$ - \$\$\$\$	🕒🕒🕒	👓	E

Legend	
Cost:	
Least Expensive	\$
Most Expensive	\$\$\$\$
Time:	
8 hours or less	🕒
9 to 40 hours	🕒🕒
Over 40 hours	🕒🕒🕒
Ease of Implementation	
Easy	π
Moderate	👓
Difficult	📖
Location of Use:	
Rural	R
Urban	U
Either rural or urban	E

Advisory Group Options

Type	Membership	Function	Authority Level	Open Participation Level	Size	Duration
Commission	Appointed by another decision making body (often elected officials and community leaders)	Oversight of particular issues; authority to make decisions with oversight from appointing body; often statutory; highly structured	High	Closed group; only formal public comment; no outside participation in group discussion	Varies; 3-20	Ongoing
Task Force	Appointed by decision making body to whom it will report; usually community leaders, technical experts, and/or interest group representatives	Performs a particular task; decision making body may defer decision authority to this group; recommendations usually have more weight than those of a typical advisory committee	Moderate to high	Closed group; limited, if any outside participation	5-20	Specific; long- or short-term, depending on task
Working Group	Appointed by decision making body to whom it will report; usually community leaders, technical experts, and/or interest group representatives	Similar to task force; generally tasked with narrow aspect of larger problem; may be a subgroup of task force or commission	Moderate to high	Closed group; limited, if any outside participation	7-10	Specific; long- or short-term, depending on task
Citizen Advisory Committee	Appointed by decision makers (often agency staff); usually represents a balance of stakeholder interests	Advises decision makers on issues, options; serves as liaisons to communities or constituents; reaches consensus on recommended course of action	Moderate	Closed group, but opportunity for other interested persons to participate in group discussion; meetings are generally open to the public	10-15	Temporary; usually a 6-month period, may be quasi-permanent

Type	Membership	Function	Authority Level	Open Participation Level	Size	Duration
Citizen Involvement Committee	Appointed by decision makers; usually represents a balance of stakeholder interests	Responsible for getting other citizens involved; assists with public involvement planning and implementation for projects in a jurisdiction	Low	Closed group, but opportunity for other interested persons to participate in group discussion; meetings are generally open to the public	10-15	Ongoing
Technical Advisory Group	Appointed by decision makers (often agency staff); usually represents agencies with oversight or responsibilities for project or program	Advises decision makers on technical and/or regulatory aspects of issues, options; serves as liaisons with their agencies; reaches consensus on feasibility of alternative actions	Moderate	Closed group; limited, if any outside participation; sometimes has liaison representatives from other groups	10-15	Temporary; a 6-month period, may be quasi-permanent
Technical Review Panel	Appointed by decision makers; recognized technical experts; often from universities, oversight agencies, or research organizations	Provides oversight to ensure credibility of technical project, program, or study	Moderate to high	Closed group; limited, if any outside participation unless requested by panel members	5-10	Ongoing or temporary, depending on nature of project, program, or study
Issue Resource Group	Self-selected, informal group of volunteers who make themselves available to decision makers as advocates for a particular resource	Provides advice (rather than group decisions or recommendations) on issues related to that resource for a specific study	Low	Open, although participants are usually knowledgeable about the resource	No limit	Temporary; long- or short-term, depending on nature of study

Type	Membership	Function	Authority Level	Open Participation Level	Size	Duration
Sounding Board	Self-selected, informal group of volunteers who make themselves available to decision makers	Provides opportunity for broad-based "bellwether" feedback on issues, options, staff recommendations; not intended to make recommendations or arrive at a consensus	Low	Open; all interested persons can participate	No limit	Temporary; most effective if used for short term
Forum	Self-selected, informal group of volunteers who make themselves available to decision makers	Explores issue or problem; can be structured to develop recommendations, but usually just raises issues and shares information	Low	Open; all interested persons can participate	No limit	Short; usually one meeting
Focus Group	Statistically selected representatives of the general public (often paid)	A survey tool rather than a public involvement method of problem solving; used to test ideas and to identify potential issues and responses	Low	Closed group	8-10	Short; usually one meeting

Note: This material is adapted from "Choosing a Format for Public Advisory Groups," published in the International Association of Public Participation Professionals newsletter by the Cascade Chapter (Portland, Oregon, area).

Data Elements

To complete all plan components, certain information or data is necessary. Some data will be required for all corridor plans, while a few will be optional according to the plan under development.

The following list of data elements is typically needed to complete a corridor plan. Included under each data element are **Data Needs**, **Sources**, and **Level of Analysis**. This spells out the information that is needed to address each element, sources for that information, and the geographic level of analysis area necessary to adequately address the element.

Standard Corridor Plan Elements

Standard data elements that should be in all corridor plans are listed below, and will be discussed in greater detail in the remainder of the section:

- Corridor Boundaries
- Statement of Purpose and Need
- General Vicinity Description
- General Terrain and Major Geologic Features
- Population Characteristics and Statistics
- Employment Characteristics and Statistics
- Facilities
 - Highways, Railroad, Air, Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian
- Environment
- Pipeline and Utility Line Locations
- Existing Plans
- Safety
- Land Use
- Transportation Connectivity
- Right of Way
- Sketch Designs of Alternatives

- Prioritized Solutions
- Future Policies

Corridor Boundaries Done on an individual basis, the boundaries could include a broad geographic area and its local, regional, and state transportation facilities (highways, rail lines, transit, bicycle paths, airports, ports), lands that could be affected by transportation improvements, and lands zoned for development that may significantly affect the operation of transportation facilities.

- **Data Needs:** Base map of region (approximate scale 1" = 200' in urban areas, and 1" = 400' or smaller in rural areas); aerial maps (approximately 1" = 200' in urban areas, 1" = 400' in rural areas).
- **Sources:** County surveyors, local comprehensive plans, metropolitan planning organizations, regional planning association, ITD aerial maps, USGS topographic maps, private firms.
- **Level of Analysis:** 1" = 200' in urban areas and 1" = 400' in rural areas.

Statement of Need Serves as the defined purpose and need for the corridor plan.

- **Data Needs:** Public and agency input and reaction.
- **Sources:** Collaborative approach utilizing community members, elected officials, ITD staff, corridor stakeholders, MPOs, regional planning associations, and Idaho Transportation Board.
- **Level of Analysis:** N/A

General Vicinity Description A broad description of the corridor and its adjoining area to provide the project setting.

- Data needs: Written overviews and descriptions from existing planning documents, and a map of the vicinity.
- Sources: Local comprehensive plans, studies.
- Level of Analysis: Encompasses corridor area and surroundings.

General Terrain and Major Geologic Features Features that could impact the feasibility of implementing certain alternatives or the further development of the existing transportation system needs.

- Data Needs: Mapped information regarding slopes, fault lines, outcroppings, soil types, etc.
- Sources: USGS topographic maps, NRCS Soil Survey, comprehensive plans, existing studies.
- Level of Analysis: 1" = 2000'.

Population Characteristics & Statistics Information about existing and future populations to define current characteristics and anticipated future level of use of the transportation system.

- Data Needs: Current and projected population, number of households, household size, household income, ethnic composition, race, age distribution.
- Sources: Utility companies, private firms, local planning departments, U.S. Bureau of the Census data (local Federal repository library or Idaho State Department of Commerce), MPOs, locally generated estimates and projections.

- Level of Analysis: City or county, by neighborhood in larger urban areas, Census Tract or Census Block groups.

Employment Characteristics/Statistics

Commuter trips have a significant impact on corridors and contribute toward increased demand for transportation facilities and services.

- Data Needs: Journey-to-work, commuting patterns, labor force data (number employed, unemployed, seasonal), employment by industry.
- Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census data (local Federal repository library or Idaho Department of Commerce), MPOs, locally generated estimates and projections, local planning departments, Idaho Department of Labor, U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Information System, university research, USDOT Bureau of Transportation statistics.
- Level of Analysis: City or County, or level that is available.

Facilities for:

Highways

Includes the primary road(s) in the corridor as well as access points for adjacent arterials, possibly collectors.

- Data Needs: Functional classification maps; traffic counts; construction plans; utility information as available; existing right of way widths; existing pavement width, condition, and configuration; existing traffic control devices; existing access control policies; percentage of truck usage; seasonal traffic volume peaks; and, current turning movement counts at major intersections.

- Sources: ITD Headquarters, ITD District offices, metropolitan planning organizations, highway districts, local governments, utility companies.
- Level of Analysis: Arterial segments.

Railroad Freight and passenger trains may run parallel or across corridor boundaries, and raise issues of at-grade railroad crossings and continued use of the rail lines. Parallel facilities are important if they serve the corridor or block movement within the corridor or crossing streets.

- Data Needs: Location of lines, at-grade crossings, grade separations, existing and projected number of trains, railroad studies, length and frequency of trains.
- Sources: ITD Headquarters, railroad companies.
- Level of Analysis: County, by railroad line, or as available.

Air General aviation facilities are available at many in-state locations, some also offer commercial service.

- Data Needs: Commercial emplanement statistics, airport locations, number of commercial carriers, private airplane traffic.
- Sources: Airport master plans, ITD Aeronautics Division.
- Level of Analysis: Airport-specific.

Transit Public or private transit, park and ride lots, vanpools, intercity bus service, and any other transit offerings.

- Data Needs: Number of carriers, location of terminals and park and ride lots, availability and number

of special purpose vans (senior citizens, special needs).

- Sources: ITD's *Movin' Idaho* (*Idaho Public Transportation Plan*), and *Idaho Statewide Public Transportation Needs and Benefits Study*.
- Level of Analysis: City or county.

Bicycle If not a formal bike path, lane, or route, shoulders of many roads serve as bicycle facilities.

- Data Needs: Route, path, and lane locations; existing and programmed or future connections to other transportation facilities.
- Sources: Local governments and ITD.
- Level of Analysis: Corridor specific, or by city or county.

Pedestrian Sidewalks, or pedestrian or hiking trails may be located along corridor routes. Safe pedestrian crossing opportunities are needed.

- Data Needs: Location of signalized and nonsignalized crosswalks, sidewalks, pedestrian or hiking trails, and connections to other transportation facilities.
- Sources: Local highway jurisdictions, local government engineers, planning departments, park and recreation departments.
- Level of Analysis: Corridor areas.

Environment A general inventory or scan of environmental and socio-economic factors will do two things: identify significant environmental features that could hinder the implementation of a particular

alternative, and protect the area's natural resources and human environment.

- **Data Needs:** Cultural resources (listed or potentially eligible historic sites, historic districts, archeological sites, cemeteries, trails), physical and environmental features (wetland areas, floodplains, state or national forests, threatened and endangered species, parks, known contaminated sites, prime and unique farmlands wildlife reserves, water bodies, critical wildlife habitat) and community features (aesthetics, residential and business district characteristics, pedestrian and bike access, etc.).
- **Sources:** Idaho State Historic Preservation Office, Idaho Department of Water Resources, Division of Environmental Quality, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, US Fish and Wildlife Service, local comprehensive plans, State Parks and Recreation Department, Natural Resource Conservation Service, US Army Corps of Engineers, Federal Emergency Management Agency, windshield surveys, interviews with stakeholders.
- **Level of Analysis:** City or county.

Pipeline and Utility Locations Utility locations are found throughout the state, and it is important to link future locations with potential improvements to existing corridors.

- **Data Needs:** Locations, types, and sizes of existing and planned lines and facilities.
- **Sources:** Utility companies.
- **Level of Analysis:** Primary corridor areas.

Existing Plans A summary of the existing local, regional, federal, and state planning documents which have

influence over the corridor will flag items that are viewed as being of critical importance to area residents, businesses, and landowners. Of particular importance are the planing document goals, objectives, policies, and strategies as they impact the corridor.

- **Data Needs:** Copies of existing land use and transportation plans for the corridor planning area.
- **Sources:** Local government comprehensive plans, metropolitan planning organization plans, regional planning associations, Idaho Transportation Plans, bike and pedestrian plans, farmland preservation plans, special land use or transportation studies conducted in the corridor area, federal agency plans.
- **Level of Analysis:** Brief summary of existing plans, including goals, objectives, policies, and strategies.

Safety What are the primary safety concerns? Where do accidents most frequently occur for all modes within the corridor? How does the accident rate in the corridor compare with statewide accident rates on similar facilities? Are existing access controls adequate, or does it appear that inadequate access controls are contributing to an unsafe condition? A solid understanding of the corridor's safety issues will give the corridor planners the best tools for improving transportation safety.

- **Data Needs:** Three years of accident records, average daily trips for the same period, existing roadway configuration, clear zones, high accident locations for all modes of travel, statewide accident rate information, access control policies, and pavement conditions.
- **Sources:** ITD Headquarters, Office of Highway Safety.
- **Level of Analysis:** Highway segments as indicated by accident statistics, intersections, etc.

Land Use Land use directly influences the feasibility of transportation modes. Likewise, the existing land use within and adjoining the corridor serves as the base upon which the corridor plan is built.

- **Data Needs:** General zoning classifications, existing and planned land use patterns, existing and planned major adjacent land development, vacant land inventory (if available), interviews with local land use planners, planning and zoning commission members, chamber of commerce, realtors, developers.
- **Sources:** Planning departments, comprehensive plans, city or county building departments, utility companies.
- **Level of Analysis:** City, county, or land within corridor boundary to the extent possible.

Transportation Connectivity How well the corridor connects various parts of the region is impacted by congestion, travel times, and transportation mode availability.

- **Data Needs:** Transportation system map, base maps.

- **Sources:** ITD Headquarters, transportation plans, comprehensive plans, metropolitan planning organizations, regional planning associations.
- **Level of Analysis:** County or multi-county.

Right of Way In many cases, additional right-of-way will be needed to implement future transportation improvements. An up-front awareness of this need coupled with the corridor plan results will guide the acquisition of future right of way in a more timely manner.

- **Data Needs:** Existing right of way boundaries, comprehensive plan and future land use map, physical constraints to expanding boundaries (e.g. existing development, slope, soils, river).
- **Sources:** ITD, local government engineers, planning departments, local comprehensive plans.
- **Level of Analysis:** Major highway segments, using general width based on typical section.

Sketch Designs of Alternatives At this level of planning, the alternatives developed will be single-line sketches rather than precise geometric detail. Rough profiles are also adequate.

- **Data Needs:** Base maps.
- **Sources:** County surveyors, local comprehensive plans, metropolitan planning organizations, regional planning associations, ITD aerial maps.
- **Level of Analysis:** As appropriate for corridor size.

Prioritized Solutions Corridor planning will inevitably lead to a number of proposed projects for future implementation. Those solutions need to be identified by their priority for funding and/or implementation in order to keep the plan action-oriented.

- Data Needs: Data from other elements.
- Sources: As noted for each element, plus public participation.
- Level of Analysis: By major highway segments.

Future Policies Upon completing the plan's physical and service inventories and determining where future improvements can be made, the next steps for establishing the course of action are laid out in the plan's approved policies.

- Data Needs: Completed plan components.
- Sources: As stated by element, and public participation.
- Level of Analysis: Corridor-wide.

Optional Elements

Depending upon the location and physical characteristics of the corridor, the following additional elements may be applicable for corridor plan inclusion:

- Tourism
- Recreation Travel
- Ports and Water-Based Transportation
- Bridges
- International/Border Considerations
- Agricultural Vehicle Movement
- Intelligent Transportation Systems

Tourism To what extent is the corridor impacted by tourist travel? If destination sites are located in the vicinity of the corridor, the impact may be quite high. At the same time, if the corridor links together a population center and a tourist destination at the opposite end, that too can result in a high level of impact.

- Data Needs: Tourist destination locations, visitor numbers, regional destinations.
- Sources: Local Chambers of Commerce, Idaho Department of Commerce, private resort managers.
- Level of Analysis: City, County, Multi-County.

Recreation Travel The types and numbers of recreational vehicles can significantly affect traffic patterns in some corridors.

- Data Needs: Vehicle classification breakdowns (trucks, recreational vehicles, automobiles).
- Sources: ITD Headquarters, local observation.
- Level of Analysis: City, county, or highway district.

Ports and Water-Based Transportation

Some areas of Idaho need to consider port traffic in their corridor planning efforts.

- Data Needs: Shipping volumes, transfer points and storage facilities.
- Sources: Local port authority.
- Level of Analysis: Port site and adjoining property.

Bridges Existing or proposed bridges need to be included on an as-needed basis.

- Data Needs: Bridge condition reports, bridge clearance and sight distance, and historical status.
- Sources: ITD Headquarters, county surveyors, city engineers, highway districts.
- Level of Analysis: Corridor areas.

International/Border Considerations Corridors abutting Canada and surrounding states must be considered in the planning process. Ties created by NAFTA, commerce, tourism, and so on have the potential for impacting corridors.

- Data Needs: Border counts, traffic counts.
- Sources: US Customs, locally generated statistics regarding tourists or commercial freight movement.
- Level of Analysis: As available.

Agricultural Vehicle Movement Particularly in rural areas, slow moving agricultural vehicles are a routine fixture on the roadway system.

- Data Needs: Accident records, zoning and comprehensive plan designations.
- Sources: Planning departments, comprehensive plans, zoning map, local highway districts, ITD Headquarters and Districts, local sheriff or police departments.
- Level of Analysis: County or where identified.

Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)

ITS can improve traveler safety and security, provide information to tourists, assist with infrastructure operations and maintenance. While perhaps not feasible for all corridors, it is potentially valuable for many others when considering 20-year planning horizons.

- Data Needs: Accident locations, roadway conditions, weather conditions.
- Sources: ITD Headquarters, ITD District offices.
- Level of Analysis: City or county.

Budget Guidelines for Corridor Planning

In preparing a budget for conducting the corridor planning process and writing the corridor plan document, several variables can be expected to affect costs.

Variables that Affect Corridor Planning Cost

1. Length and Complexity of Corridor
2. Generation of New Data
3. Transportation Forecasting and Analysis
4. Mapping and Graphics
5. Printing Costs
6. Public Participation Process

The **length and the complexity** of the corridor area can greatly affect the complexity of a corridor. The following components also affect the complexity:

- Different modes, sizes, and purposes of transportation facilities in the corridor area,
- Growing and shifting land uses in the area,
- Sensitive environmental resource issues,
- Several different local government and highway district jurisdictions, and
- Controversial issues and extensive public interest.

A long and complex corridor area will require more data gathering and analysis, and will increase the cost of corridor planning correspondingly.

Another variable cost is the **generation of new data**. Since corridor planning is a general, long-range planning process, only general data is necessary. Generating new data should be discouraged except in geographic

locations where adequate data is unavailable, or when an issue central to the corridor area or to the alternatives lacks adequate data for analysis. In addition, origin-destination information is very valuable where competing routes exist. When generating new data is necessary, forming a partnership with other agencies that may use the data, to jointly pay for the data gathering, should be considered as a cost saving method.

Transportation forecasting and analysis is another variable. If a regional transportation model is already in use and up-to-date, use of the model should be cost-effective. If the model needs to be updated, or if a new model must be developed, it will sharply increase the cost of the corridor planning project. Costs to create accurate population and employment forecasts can also be key.

The variables described above afford few opportunities for cost savings. However, mapping and graphics, printing and distribution, public participation techniques, and the number of public participation events can offer opportunities for cost savings.

Mapping and graphics costs can be minimized by using existing maps as much as possible, and by limiting the use of color (for reproduction purposes).

Printing costs can also be minimized by limiting the use of color, by limiting the number of Corridor Plan documents produced and mailed, and putting the document on the Internet. Use of large displays at public participation events rather than individual packets can also reduce costs.

The types of **public participation techniques that are planned**, and the **number of public participation events**, can also be an opportunity for cost savings. The type and number of public participation opportunities should be tailored to the needs of the community which the corridor will serve, and to the desire of the community for active involvement.

Cost Elements of Public Participation

- Printing, mailing, duplicating
- Room rental
- Displays
- Refreshments
- Advertising
- Film and processing
- Computer programs
- Office space for drop-in center
- Telephone charges
- Number of staff in attendance
- Use of specialists

A minimum of four events for public participation should be included in each corridor planning process. An opportunity should be included to generate the need statement and identify the goals. Additional opportunities should also be used later in the process to help generate the initial list of alternatives, screen the Feasible List, and to help generate the Preferred Alternatives.

Because public participation is one of the few cost elements that can be implemented at many different levels, it may be tempting to cut back on public participation to reduce the total cost of conducting the corridor planning process. However, it is important to remember that public participation is central to meaningful corridor planning. The most useful corridor management strategies and improvements are the ones backed by public support.

Example of Alternatives Screening Process

The screening process that is selected for developing each corridor plan must be simple enough for everyone to understand and participate in, and structured enough to demonstrate substantiation of the recommended choices. Such a process was used successfully in Idaho during the ITD-sponsored North Pocatello/Chubbuck Major Investment Study. This general approach would work equally well for roadway alignments and alternate mode comparisons. A description of the process is provided below.

North Pocatello/Chubbuck Major Investment Study Screening Process

As part of the North Pocatello/Chubbuck Major Investment Study process, each of the performance objectives were weighted by a factor that represented their relative importance when compared to one another. These weighting factors were developed jointly with the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the Bannock Planning Organization, the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Pocatello Metropolitan area. The CAC and TAC were then provided with the analysis of each objective for all the alternatives.

The results of this analysis ranged from numerical quantitative measures to qualitative impacts (high, medium, low). The CAC and TAC reviewed the analysis and ranked each of the alternatives from best to worst for all the performance objectives. No ties were allowed. This forced the CAC and TAC to evaluate the alternatives and provide their best judgment (with analysis provided)

regarding the alternatives' positive and negative characteristics.

The best to worst ratings were multiplied by the weighting factors to reflect the importance of each performance objective to develop an overall score for each alternative. The scores were then compared, and the best overall alternative was chosen as the preferred alternative.

This methodology, although simple, was very effective in illustrating what the important project issues were, as well as how the alternatives fared against one another in a comparison. Each of the alternatives had their good and bad attributes, but the approach provided the means to determine which was the best overall.

Additional information on the North Pocatello/Chubbuck Major Investment Study may be obtained from the Intermodal Planning section of the ITD Division of Transportation Planning.

List of Agencies

Listed below are agencies as sources for some of the data referenced in Step 3, pertaining to environmental and land use conditions. Headquarters are identified in all cases, along with district addresses where available. Check with the headquarters offices to find out if there are district offices that can best meet your needs.

STATE AGENCIES

Idaho Fish and Game

Wildlife and Fish Resources

Regional Offices

Headquarters

600 S. Walnut

P.O. Box 25

Boise, ID 83707

(208) 334-3700

Panhandle Region

2750 Kathleen Avenue

Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

(208) 769-1414

Clearwater Region

1540 Warner Avenue

Lewiston, ID 83501

(208) 799-5010

Southwest Region

3101 S. Powerline Road

Nampa, ID 83686

(208) 465-8465

(208) 887-6729

McCall

555 Deinhard Lane

McCall, ID 83638

(208) 634-8137

Magic Valley Region

868 East Main Street

P.O. Box 428

Jerome, ID 83338

(208) 324-4350

Southeast Region

1345 Barton Road

Pocatello, ID 83204

(208) 232-4703

Upper Snake Region

1515 Lincoln Road

Idaho Falls, ID 83401

(208) 525-7290

Salmon Region

1214 Hwy 93 N.

P.O. Box 1336

Salmon, ID 83467

(208) 756-2271

Fish and Wildlife Issues

Scott Grunder

3101 S. Powerline Road

Nampa, ID 83686

(208) 887-6729

Idaho Department of Water Resources

Water Resource Issues

Gene Gibson

2735 Airport Way

Boise, ID 83705

(208) 334-2190

Flood Plain Coordinator

1301 N. Orchard

Boise, ID 83706

(208) 327-7993

Streams and Water Quality

IDWR State office

1301 North Orchard Street

Boise, ID 83706

(208) 327-7900

IDWR Northern Regional office
1910 Northwest Blvd., Suite 210
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814-2615
(208) 769-1450

IDWR Western Regional office
2735 Airport Way
Boise, ID 83705-5082
(208) 334-2190

IDWR Southern Regional office
1341 Fillmore St., Suite 200
Twin Falls, ID 83301-3380
(208) 736-3033

IDWR Eastern Regional Office
900 North Skyline Drive
Idaho Falls, ID 83402-6105
(208) 525-7161

IDWR Salmon office
Van Dreff Office Complex, Suite B
Salmon, ID 83467
(208) 756-6644

Idaho Division of Environmental Quality

Air & Water Quality Contacts (3.9.98)

IDEQ-Coeur d'Alene Regional Office
2110 Ironwood Parkway
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

Air Dan Redline
(208) 769-1422-Voice
(208) 769-1404-Fax
dredline@deq.state.id.us

Water Jack Skille
(208) 769-1422-Voice
(208) 769-1404-Fax
jskille@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Lewiston Regional Office
1118 F Street
Lewiston, ID 83501

Air Bob Jeffries
(208) 799-4370-Voice
(208) 799-3451-Fax
bjeffrie@deq.state.id.us

Water John Cardwell
(208) 799-4370-Voice
(208) 799-3451-Fax
jcardwel@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Boise Regional Office
1445 North Orchard
Boise, ID 83706-2239

Air Alison Miller-Gonzalez
(208) 373-0550-Voice
(208) 373-0287-Fax
amiller@deq.state.id.us

Water Craig Shepard
(208) 373-0550-Voice
(208) 373-0287-Fax
cshepard@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Twin Falls Regional Office
601 Pole Line Road, Suite 2
Twin Falls, ID 83301

Air Steve VanZandt
(208) 736-2190-Voice
(208) 736-2194-Fax
svanzand@deq.state.id.us

Water Darren Brandt
(208) 736-2190-Voice
(208) 736-2194-Fax
dbrandt@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Pocatello Regional Office
224 South Arthur
Pocatello, ID 83204

Air Audrey Cole
(208) 236-6160-Voice
(208) 236-6168-Fax
acole@deq.state.id.us

Water Lynn Van Every
(208) 236-6160-Voice
(208) 236-6168-Fax
lvanever@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Idaho Falls Regional Office
900 Skyline, Suite B
Idaho Falls, ID 83402

Air Catherine Reno
(208) 528-2650-Voice
(208) 528-2695-Fax
creno@deq.state.id.us

Water Chris Mebane
(208) 528-2650-Voice
(208) 528-2695-Fax
cmebane@deq.state.id.us

OTHER STATE AGENCIES

Parks and Park Development

Idaho State Parks and Recreation
5657 Warm Springs Avenue
Boise, ID
(208) 334-4199

State Lands Managed for State Endowment

Idaho Department of Lands
954 W. Jefferson
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0050
(208) 334-0200

Population Statistics

Idaho State Department of Commerce
700 West State Street
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0093
(208) 334-2470

FEDERAL

Threatened and Endangered Species

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
4696 Overland Road
Boise, ID 83705
(208) 334-1931

Prime Agriculture Land

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
State Conservationist Office
3244 Elder Street
Boise, ID 83705
(208) 378-5700

Lands Information and Maps

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Idaho State Office
1387 Vinnell Way
Boise, ID
(208) 373-4000

Environmental Issues

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
422 W. Washington
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-9488

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Offices

Wetlands and Waterways

Corps of Engineers
Coeur d'Alene Regulatory Office
Idaho Panhandle National Forest
3815 Schreiber Way
Coeur d'Alene, ID, 83814-8363
(208) 765-7237

Corps of Engineers
Boise Regulatory Office
Lucky Peak Project Office
HC-33, Box 1020
Boise, ID 83706-9302
(208) 343-0671

Corps of Engineers
Idaho Falls Regulatory Office
Exchange Plaza
1820 East 17th , Suite 350
Idaho Falls, ID 83404
(208) 522-1645

District Office
Corps of Engineers
Walla Walla District
Regulatory Branch
201 North 3rd Street
Walla Walla, WA 99362
(509) 527-7150

Regional Archaeological Centers

Archaeological Survey of Idaho, Northern
Repository
Laboratory of Anthropology
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83843
(208) 885-6123

Archaeological Survey of Idaho, Western
Repository
Idaho State Historical Society
210 Main Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-3847

Archaeological Survey of Idaho, Eastern
Repository
Museum of Natural History
Box 8096
Idaho State University
Pocatello, ID 83209
(208) 236-3131

State Historic and Cultural Resources

State Highway Archaeologist
Idaho Transportation Department
P.O. Box 7129
Boise, ID 83707
(208) 334-8479

State Historic Preservation Office
Idaho State Historical Society
210 Main Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-3861

Tribal Contacts

Northwestern Band, Shoshone
31 West Bridge
P.O. Box 637

Blackfoot, ID 83221
(208) 785-7401

Kootenai Tribal Council
P.O. Box 1269
Bonners Ferry, ID 83805
(208) 267-3519

Shoshone-Paiute Tribes
P.O. Box 219
Owyhee, NV 89832
(208) 757-3161

Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Idaho
Tribal Headquarters
Plummer, ID 83851
(208) 686-1800

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
P.O. Box 306
Fort Hall, ID 83203
(208) 238-3700

Nez Perce Tribe
P.O. Box 365
Lapwai, ID 83540
(208) 843-2253

Metropolitan Planning Organizations

Ada Planning Association
413 W. Idaho #100
Boise, ID 83702-6064
(208) 345-5274

Bannock Planning Organization
214 E. Center
Pocatello, ID 83201
(208) 233-9322

Bonneville Metropolitan Planning Organization
City of Idaho Falls
380 Constitution Way
Idaho Falls, ID 83405-0220
(208) 528-5530

Regional Planning Organizations

Region I

Panhandle Area Council
11100 Airport Drive
Hayden, ID 83835
(208) 772-0584

Region II

Clearwater Economic Development
Association
1626 6th Avenue N.
Lewiston, ID 83501
(208) 746-0015

Region III

Ida-Ore Planning & Development Association,
Inc.
10624 W. Executive Drive
Boise, ID 83704
(208) 322-7033/(800) 859-0321

Region IV

Region IV Development Assn.
315 Falls Ave.
P.O. Box 1844
Twin Falls, ID 83303
(208) 736-3064

Region V

Southeast Idaho Council of
Governments, Inc.
280 S. Arthur
Pocatello, ID 83201
(208) 233-4032

Region VI

East Central Idaho Planning
& Development Assn.
310 North 2nd East
Rexburg, ID 83440
(208) 356-4524

Bear Lake Regional Commission

Bear Lake Regional Commission
P.O. Box 26
2661 U.S. 89
Fish Haven, ID 83287
(208) 945-2333

OTHER AGENCIES

Local Highway Technical Assistance Council
1436 Bannock Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 344-0565

Idaho Association of Highway
Districts, Inc.
1436 Bannock Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 345-5176

Idaho Association of Counties
700 West Washington
P.O. Box 1623
Boise, ID 83701
(208) 345-9126

Association of Idaho Cities
3314 Grace Street
Boise, ID 83703
(208) 344-8594

Reference Materials

Arizona Department of Transportation: Transportation Planning Group. State Route 77 Tucson to Holbrook, Corridor Profile Review, Scope of Work. 1995.

Arkansas State Highway Commission. Agreement for Engineering and Environmental Services. State Job No. 001747, FAP No. DPS-A015(7). April 9, 1995.

Bevan, Timothy A. Planning Procedures and Requirements for Highway Corridor Studies. Compendium of Technical Papers. Institute of Transportation Engineers District 6 Annual Meeting. Anchorage, Alaska. July 1992.

Bishop, Kirk R. Designing Urban Corridors. American Planning Association.

Bonsignore, R. A., C. R. Brown, B. Fitzsimons, T. A. Hammerberg, W. R. Morrish, and L. M. Neckar. "Building Community Across the Corridor: A New Parkway Model for Chanhassen, MN." Design Center for American Urban Landscape. University of Minnesota. 1992.

Cape Cod Commission. Old King's Highway/Route 6A, Corridor Management Plan. April 1, 1995.

Capitol Region Council of Governments. Corridor Management & Improvement Plans: Scope of Work. Hartford, Connecticut. October 27, 1994.

Chattanooga/Hamilton County Regional Planning Agency. The Transportation Land Use Link, Position Paper/Walter Kulash: Speaker, November 96 TDI. March 1997.

CH2M HILL. U.S. 14-IL 173 Bypass; Harvard Hills Road Extension. May 1997.

CH2M HILL Study Team. Heart of Illinois Highway Feasibility Study, Executive Summary. September 1995.

City Planning & Development Department, Planning and Urban Design Division. Blue Ridge Corridor Plan. October 1990.

City of Durham, North Carolina. Section 24-4.D.5. Major Transportation Corridor. City Ordinance.

Denver Regional Council of Governments, Regional Transportation District, and Colorado Department of Transportation. East, West, and Southeast Corridor Major Investment Studies: Guidance Manual for Technical Analysis. June 1997.

Florida Department of Transportation. East-West Multimodal Corridor Study and Miami Intermodal Center Study, Major Investment Studies. August 1, 1995.

Johnson, Donna Franklin, and William E. Issel. "Three for the Road." *Planning*. May 1989. Pp. 17-22.

JRH Transportation Engineering. Oregon Highway 42 Corridor Strategy, Oregon Department of Transportation Region 3, 3500 N.W. Stewart Parkway, Roseburg, Oregon 97470.

JRH Transportation Engineering. Transportation Corridor Study, Coos Bay to Roseburg Corridor Strategy, Oregon Department of Transportation.

Lehr & Associates, Inc. Draft Policy Implement, State of Delaware Department of Transportation, Subject: State Access Management Policy. Trenton, NJ. July 1997.

Maiorana, John J. "Preserving Transportation Corridors." *TR News*. Vol. 187. December 1996. Pp. 18-21.

Martin, Larry, and Paula Green. "Gaining Project Acceptance." *Civil Engineering*. August 1995.

North Carolina Department of Transportation. Thoroughfare Plan for the City of Morganton. February 1997.

North Carolina Department of Transportation. Phase 1 Environmental Study, Implementation Guidelines. 1996.

Oregon Department of Transportation, CH2M HILL, and Jeanne Lawson Associates. Portland to Lincoln City Corridor, Oregon Highways 99W and 18, I-5 to U.S. 101, Interim Corridor Strategy. March 1997.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Corridor Planning. World Wide Web Site. <<http://www.odot.state.or.us/tdb/planning/corridor/purpose.html>>. July 3, 1996.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Final Draft Oregon Highway 82 Corridor Plan, Transportation Improvement and Management Element Capital Improvement Decisions. November 15, 1996.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Corridor Overview. Draft Document. May 1994.

Otak, Pacific Rim Resources, and Kittelson and Associates. Oregon Highway 82 Corridor Strategy, La Grande - Wallowa Lake.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Draft Oregon Highway 82 Corridor Plan, Technical Appendix. June 30, 1997.

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., et al. Oregon Coast Highway Corridor Master Plan. November 1994.

Rhees, Suzanne Sutro. "Zoning the Interchange." *Zoning News*. American Planning Association. December 1993.

Rivkin, Malcolm D., and Goldie W. Rivkin. "Transportation Corridor Preservation." *Urban Land*. November 1993. Pp. 24-28.

State of Alaska Department of Transportation. Appendix B, Statement of Services, Southeast Alaska Transportation Plan. November 15, 1996.

State of California Department of Transportation. Route Concept Report Guidelines. December 1997.

State of California Department of Transportation. Transportation Concept Report, Interstate 8. November 1996.

State of California Department of Transportation. Transportation Planning Program. System Planning Final Guidance for Transportation System Development Program. Memorandum to District Division Chiefs Planning and Public Transportation. March 30, 1995.

State of California Department of Transportation. System Planning—Interim Instructions. November 3, 1994.

State of California Department of Transportation. District System Management Plan: Guidelines. July 1991.

State of Illinois Department of Transportation. Illinois Bureau of Design and Environment Manual. July 1995.

Tom Hudson Company. Northwest Passage, Clearwater Canyons Scenic Byway, Corridor Management Plan. February 1997.

US 301 Transportation Study Task Force. US 301 Transportation Study Final Report. November 1996.

Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Transit Administration. Milwaukee East-West Corridor Transportation Study, Major Investment Study/Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Executive Summary. May 1, 1997.

Glossary of Terms

Arterials	A high level of traffic mobility and a low level of access to land.
Collectors	Medium level traffic mobility and medium level of access to land.
Corridor	A broad geographic area, defined by logical, existing and forecasted travel patterns served by various modal transportation systems that provide important connections within and between regions of the state for people, goods, and services. Travel within the corridor may include vehicular, rail, transit, water, air, or nonmotorized.
Corridor Plan	Document that defines a comprehensive package of recommendations for managing and improving the transportation system within and along a specific corridor, based on a 20-year planning horizon.
Corridor Planning	A process to develop a corridor plan that is collaborative with local governments and includes extensive public participation opportunities.
Corridor Preservation	The identification and protection of highway corridors or the path of a new or existing highway needed for future construction.
Functional Classification	<p>The process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of service they are intended to provide.</p> <p>Basic to this process is the recognition that individual roads do not serve travel independently in any major way. Rather, most travel involves movement through a network of roads. It becomes necessary, then, to determine how this travel can be channelized within the network in a logical and efficient manner. Functional classification defines the nature of this channelization process by defining the part that any particular road or street should play in serving the flow of trips through a highway network.</p> <p>Allied to the idea of traffic channelization is the dual role the highway network plays in providing access to property and traffic mobility. Highways are grouped into arterials, collectors, or locals. Further distinctions can be made (rural, urban, major, minor, etc.). For a more comprehensive discussion, see Highway Functional Classification: Concepts Criteria and Procedures (FHWA, 1989).</p>

Goals	These are typically measurable, adopted goals that are created in response to a Corridor Plan's statement of need. They prescribe standards that the future transportation system should meet. For example, "By the Year 2010, 20 miles of bicycle lanes will be added to the existing system," or "The level of service on Highway Z will be maintained at its current level." The corridor plan's recommended alternatives are expected to meet the goals for the corridor.
Intermodal	Refers to the connections between transportation modes.
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
Local	Local roads or streets that have a low level of traffic mobility and a high level of land access. In addition to functional classification this phrase may also refer to local government having jurisdiction for a highway or system.
Local Highway Jurisdiction	Refers to any City, County, or Highway District that has jurisdiction over a highway system.
Metropolitan Planning Organization	The organization designated to carry out the transportation planning process for metropolitan areas, according to 23 USC 134.
Mode	Refers to the infrastructure or the form of transporting goods or people: aviation; highway; automobile and small truck; bicycle; transit (bus, van); large truck (freight); pedestrian; rail; and waterways (barge, ferry).
Multimodal	Refers to the availability of transportation options within a system or corridor.
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
Private Transit	Refers to any transportation service where all of the service is privately funded, typically jitney or shuttle systems.
Public Participation	A collaborative process that encourages stakeholders to participate in the plan's formation and, ultimately, conclusion. Public involvement typically comes from outreach, data-gathering, and participation.
Public Transit	Refers to any transit service where all or part of the service is publicly funded. Services can range from fixed route, route deviation, and vanpool.
Public Transportation	Refers to any transportation service where all or part of the service is publicly funded, typically limited to local bus systems or paratransit.

Shuttle	Usually a service provided with an up-to-20 passenger vehicle connecting major trip destinations and origins on a fixed- or route-deviation basis. Shuttles can provide feeder services to main transit routes, or operate in a point-to-point or circular fashion.
Stakeholders	The term refers to groups or their representatives having an interest (stake) in the outcome of the corridor planning process. Typical stakeholders include elected officials, planning and zoning commissioners, metropolitan planning organizations, sewer districts, utility companies, business interests, agencies, and neighborhood associations.
Transit	Refers to passenger service, typically with a seating capacity of more than seven persons including the driver, and provided to the general public at published fares.
Transportation Alternatives Analysis	This technology compares possible courses of action to resolve a transportation issue using one or more criteria or factors. ISTEA requires alternatives analysis at the major investment study (MIS) level of project development. NEPA requires such analysis in the environmental impact statement (EIS) or environmental assessment (EA) process. The process by which possible solutions are compared, including the criteria employed, the measures of the criteria applied, and the results of the comparison presented, has substantial impact on the quality of the ultimate project selection. In fact, such alternatives analysis is usually the bridge between the technical project aspects and political decision making.
Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	The primary product of implementing a TDM program should be reduced peak period traffic congestion and air pollution. TDM programs include a variety of employer-provided incentives aimed at inducing commuters to rideshare, use transit, walk, or bicycle to work. Incentives include preferential parking, matching services, bicycle facilities, and award programs.
Transportation Facilities	Individual modal or multimodal conveyances and terminals such as airports (terminals, flight zone); highways (roadways, rights of way, grade separations, bridges); rail (terminals, freight yards); waterways (ports, harbor); transit stations; and bicycle paths.
Transportation Services	Refer to the form of transporting goods or people: aviation, automobile, small truck, bicycle, transit (bus, van), large truck (freight), rail, barge, and ferry.

**Transportation Systems
Management (TSM)**

Cooperative development and implementation of strategies to maximize the safe movement of people and goods by managing an integrated multimodal transportation system. The effective management of the system will enable the traveling public more efficient use of the existing transportation facilities. Elements of TSM include incident management programs, traveler information systems, traffic signal systems upgrades, intermodal freight planning, surveillance control systems, demand management techniques, and commercial vehicle operations.

Budget Guidelines for Corridor Planning

In preparing a budget for conducting the corridor planning process and writing the corridor plan document, several variables can be expected to affect costs.

Variables that Affect Corridor Planning Cost

1. Length and Complexity of Corridor
2. Generation of New Data
3. Transportation Forecasting and Analysis
4. Mapping and Graphics
5. Printing Costs
6. Public Participation Process

The **length and the complexity** of the corridor area can greatly affect the complexity of a corridor. The following components also affect the complexity:

- Different modes, sizes, and purposes of transportation facilities in the corridor area,
- Growing and shifting land uses in the area,
- Sensitive environmental resource issues,
- Several different local government and highway district jurisdictions, and
- Controversial issues and extensive public interest.

A long and complex corridor area will require more data gathering and analysis, and will increase the cost of corridor planning correspondingly.

Another variable cost is the **generation of new data**. Since corridor planning is a general, long-range planning process, only general data is necessary. Generating new data should be discouraged except in geographic

locations where adequate data is unavailable, or when an issue central to the corridor area or to the alternatives lacks adequate data for analysis. In addition, origin-destination information is very valuable where competing routes exist. When generating new data is necessary, forming a partnership with other agencies that may use the data, to jointly pay for the data gathering, should be considered as a cost saving method.

Transportation forecasting and analysis is another variable. If a regional transportation model is already in use and up-to-date, use of the model should be cost-effective. If the model needs to be updated, or if a new model must be developed, it will sharply increase the cost of the corridor planning project. Costs to create accurate population and employment forecasts can also be key.

The variables described above afford few opportunities for cost savings. However, mapping and graphics, printing and distribution, public participation techniques, and the number of public participation events can offer opportunities for cost savings.

Mapping and graphics costs can be minimized by using existing maps as much as possible, and by limiting the use of color (for reproduction purposes).

Printing costs can also be minimized by limiting the use of color, by limiting the number of Corridor Plan documents produced and mailed, and putting the document on the Internet. Use of large displays at public participation events rather than individual packets can also reduce costs.

The types of **public participation techniques that are planned**, and the **number of public participation events**, can also be an opportunity for cost savings. The type and number of public participation opportunities should be tailored to the needs of the community which the corridor will serve, and to the desire of the community for active involvement.

Cost Elements of Public Participation

- Printing, mailing, duplicating
- Room rental
- Displays
- Refreshments
- Advertising
- Film and processing
- Computer programs
- Office space for drop-in center
- Telephone charges
- Number of staff in attendance
- Use of specialists

A minimum of four events for public participation should be included in each corridor planning process. An opportunity should be included to generate the need statement and identify the goals. Additional opportunities should also be used later in the process to help generate the initial list of alternatives, screen the Feasible List, and to help generate the Preferred Alternatives.

Because public participation is one of the few cost elements that can be implemented at many different levels, it may be tempting to cut back on public participation to reduce the total cost of conducting the corridor planning process. However, it is important to remember that public participation is central to meaningful corridor planning. The most useful corridor management strategies and improvements are the ones backed by public support.

Example of Alternatives Screening Process

The screening process that is selected for developing each corridor plan must be simple enough for everyone to understand and participate in, and structured enough to demonstrate substantiation of the recommended choices. Such a process was used successfully in Idaho during the ITD-sponsored North Pocatello/Chubbuck Major Investment Study. This general approach would work equally well for roadway alignments and alternate mode comparisons. A description of the process is provided below.

North Pocatello/Chubbuck Major Investment Study Screening Process

As part of the North Pocatello/Chubbuck Major Investment Study process, each of the performance objectives were weighted by a factor that represented their relative importance when compared to one another. These weighting factors were developed jointly with the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the Bannock Planning Organization, the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Pocatello Metropolitan area. The CAC and TAC were then provided with the analysis of each objective for all the alternatives.

The results of this analysis ranged from numerical quantitative measures to qualitative impacts (high, medium, low). The CAC and TAC reviewed the analysis and ranked each of the alternatives from best to worst for all the performance objectives. No ties were allowed. This forced the CAC and TAC to evaluate the alternatives and provide their best judgment (with analysis provided)

regarding the alternatives' positive and negative characteristics.

The best to worst ratings were multiplied by the weighting factors to reflect the importance of each performance objective to develop an overall score for each alternative. The scores were then compared, and the best overall alternative was chosen as the preferred alternative.

This methodology, although simple, was very effective in illustrating what the important project issues were, as well as how the alternatives fared against one another in a comparison. Each of the alternatives had their good and bad attributes, but the approach provided the means to determine which was the best overall.

Additional information on the North Pocatello/Chubbuck Major Investment Study may be obtained from the Intermodal Planning section of the ITD Division of Transportation Planning.

List of Agencies

Listed below are agencies as sources for some of the data referenced in Step 3, pertaining to environmental and land use conditions. Headquarters are identified in all cases, along with district addresses where available. Check with the headquarters offices to find out if there are district offices that can best meet your needs.

STATE AGENCIES

Idaho Fish and Game

Wildlife and Fish Resources

Regional Offices

Headquarters

600 S. Walnut

P.O. Box 25

Boise, ID 83707

(208) 334-3700

Panhandle Region

2750 Kathleen Avenue

Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

(208) 769-1414

Clearwater Region

1540 Warner Avenue

Lewiston, ID 83501

(208) 799-5010

Southwest Region

3101 S. Powerline Road

Nampa, ID 83686

(208) 465-8465

(208) 887-6729

McCall

555 Deinhard Lane

McCall, ID 83638

(208) 634-8137

Magic Valley Region

868 East Main Street

P.O. Box 428

Jerome, ID 83338

(208) 324-4350

Southeast Region

1345 Barton Road

Pocatello, ID 83204

(208) 232-4703

Upper Snake Region

1515 Lincoln Road

Idaho Falls, ID 83401

(208) 525-7290

Salmon Region

1214 Hwy 93 N.

P.O. Box 1336

Salmon, ID 83467

(208) 756-2271

Fish and Wildlife Issues

Scott Grunder

3101 S. Powerline Road

Nampa, ID 83686

(208) 887-6729

Idaho Department of Water Resources

Water Resource Issues

Gene Gibson

2735 Airport Way

Boise, ID 83705

(208) 334-2190

Flood Plain Coordinator

1301 N. Orchard

Boise, ID 83706

(208) 327-7993

Streams and Water Quality

IDWR State office

1301 North Orchard Street

Boise, ID 83706

(208) 327-7900

IDWR Northern Regional office
1910 Northwest Blvd., Suite 210
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814-2615
(208) 769-1450

IDWR Western Regional office
2735 Airport Way
Boise, ID 83705-5082
(208) 334-2190

IDWR Southern Regional office
1341 Fillmore St., Suite 200
Twin Falls, ID 83301-3380
(208) 736-3033

IDWR Eastern Regional Office
900 North Skyline Drive
Idaho Falls, ID 83402-6105
(208) 525-7161

IDWR Salmon office
Van Dreff Office Complex, Suite B
Salmon, ID 83467
(208) 756-6644

Idaho Division of Environmental Quality

Air & Water Quality Contacts (3.9.98)

IDEQ-Coeur d'Alene Regional Office
2110 Ironwood Parkway
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

Air Dan Redline
(208) 769-1422-Voice
(208) 769-1404-Fax
dredline@deq.state.id.us

Water Jack Skille
(208) 769-1422-Voice
(208) 769-1404-Fax
jskille@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Lewiston Regional Office
1118 F Street
Lewiston, ID 83501

Air Bob Jeffries
(208) 799-4370-Voice
(208) 799-3451-Fax
bjeffrie@deq.state.id.us

Water John Cardwell
(208) 799-4370-Voice
(208) 799-3451-Fax
jcardwel@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Boise Regional Office
1445 North Orchard
Boise, ID 83706-2239

Air Alison Miller-Gonzalez
(208) 373-0550-Voice
(208) 373-0287-Fax
amiller@deq.state.id.us

Water Craig Shepard
(208) 373-0550-Voice
(208) 373-0287-Fax
cshepard@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Twin Falls Regional Office
601 Pole Line Road, Suite 2
Twin Falls, ID 83301

Air Steve VanZandt
(208) 736-2190-Voice
(208) 736-2194-Fax
svanzand@deq.state.id.us

Water Darren Brandt
(208) 736-2190-Voice
(208) 736-2194-Fax
dbrandt@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Pocatello Regional Office
224 South Arthur
Pocatello, ID 83204

Air Audrey Cole
(208) 236-6160-Voice
(208) 236-6168-Fax
acole@deq.state.id.us

Water Lynn Van Every
(208) 236-6160-Voice
(208) 236-6168-Fax
lvanever@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Idaho Falls Regional Office
900 Skyline, Suite B
Idaho Falls, ID 83402

Air Catherine Reno
(208) 528-2650-Voice
(208) 528-2695-Fax
creno@deq.state.id.us

Water Chris Mebane
(208) 528-2650-Voice
(208) 528-2695-Fax
cmebane@deq.state.id.us

OTHER STATE AGENCIES

Parks and Park Development

Idaho State Parks and Recreation
5657 Warm Springs Avenue
Boise, ID
(208) 334-4199

State Lands Managed for State Endowment

Idaho Department of Lands
954 W. Jefferson
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0050
(208) 334-0200

Population Statistics

Idaho State Department of Commerce
700 West State Street
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0093
(208) 334-2470

FEDERAL

Threatened and Endangered Species

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
4696 Overland Road
Boise, ID 83705
(208) 334-1931

Prime Agriculture Land

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
State Conservationist Office
3244 Elder Street
Boise, ID 83705
(208) 378-5700

Lands Information and Maps

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Idaho State Office
1387 Vinnell Way
Boise, ID
(208) 373-4000

Environmental Issues

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
422 W. Washington
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-9488

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Offices

Wetlands and Waterways

Corps of Engineers
Coeur d'Alene Regulatory Office
Idaho Panhandle National Forest
3815 Schreiber Way
Coeur d'Alene, ID, 83814-8363
(208) 765-7237

Corps of Engineers
Boise Regulatory Office
Lucky Peak Project Office
HC-33, Box 1020
Boise, ID 83706-9302
(208) 343-0671

Corps of Engineers
Idaho Falls Regulatory Office
Exchange Plaza
1820 East 17th , Suite 350
Idaho Falls, ID 83404
(208) 522-1645

District Office
Corps of Engineers
Walla Walla District
Regulatory Branch
201 North 3rd Street
Walla Walla, WA 99362
(509) 527-7150

Regional Archaeological Centers

Archaeological Survey of Idaho, Northern
Repository
Laboratory of Anthropology
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83843
(208) 885-6123

Archaeological Survey of Idaho, Western
Repository
Idaho State Historical Society
210 Main Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-3847

Archaeological Survey of Idaho, Eastern
Repository
Museum of Natural History
Box 8096
Idaho State University
Pocatello, ID 83209
(208) 236-3131

State Historic and Cultural Resources

State Highway Archaeologist
Idaho Transportation Department
P.O. Box 7129
Boise, ID 83707
(208) 334-8479

State Historic Preservation Office
Idaho State Historical Society
210 Main Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-3861

Tribal Contacts

Northwestern Band, Shoshone
31 West Bridge
P.O. Box 637

Blackfoot, ID 83221
(208) 785-7401

Kootenai Tribal Council
P.O. Box 1269
Bonners Ferry, ID 83805
(208) 267-3519

Shoshone-Paiute Tribes
P.O. Box 219
Owyhee, NV 89832
(208) 757-3161

Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Idaho
Tribal Headquarters
Plummer, ID 83851
(208) 686-1800

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
P.O. Box 306
Fort Hall, ID 83203
(208) 238-3700

Nez Perce Tribe
P.O. Box 365
Lapwai, ID 83540
(208) 843-2253

Metropolitan Planning Organizations

Ada Planning Association
413 W. Idaho #100
Boise, ID 83702-6064
(208) 345-5274

Bannock Planning Organization
214 E. Center
Pocatello, ID 83201
(208) 233-9322

Bonneville Metropolitan Planning Organization
City of Idaho Falls
380 Constitution Way
Idaho Falls, ID 83405-0220
(208) 528-5530

Regional Planning Organizations

Region I

Panhandle Area Council
11100 Airport Drive
Hayden, ID 83835
(208) 772-0584

Region II

Clearwater Economic Development
Association
1626 6th Avenue N.
Lewiston, ID 83501
(208) 746-0015

Region III

Ida-Ore Planning & Development Association,
Inc.
10624 W. Executive Drive
Boise, ID 83704
(208) 322-7033/(800) 859-0321

Region IV

Region IV Development Assn.
315 Falls Ave.
P.O. Box 1844
Twin Falls, ID 83303
(208) 736-3064

Region V

Southeast Idaho Council of
Governments, Inc.
280 S. Arthur
Pocatello, ID 83201
(208) 233-4032

Region VI

East Central Idaho Planning
& Development Assn.
310 North 2nd East
Rexburg, ID 83440
(208) 356-4524

Bear Lake Regional Commission

Bear Lake Regional Commission
P.O. Box 26
2661 U.S. 89
Fish Haven, ID 83287
(208) 945-2333

OTHER AGENCIES

Local Highway Technical Assistance Council
1436 Bannock Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 344-0565

Idaho Association of Highway
Districts, Inc.
1436 Bannock Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 345-5176

Idaho Association of Counties
700 West Washington
P.O. Box 1623
Boise, ID 83701
(208) 345-9126

Association of Idaho Cities
3314 Grace Street
Boise, ID 83703
(208) 344-8594

Reference Materials

Arizona Department of Transportation: Transportation Planning Group. State Route 77 Tucson to Holbrook, Corridor Profile Review, Scope of Work. 1995.

Arkansas State Highway Commission. Agreement for Engineering and Environmental Services. State Job No. 001747, FAP No. DPS-A015(7). April 9, 1995.

Bevan, Timothy A. Planning Procedures and Requirements for Highway Corridor Studies. Compendium of Technical Papers. Institute of Transportation Engineers District 6 Annual Meeting. Anchorage, Alaska. July 1992.

Bishop, Kirk R. Designing Urban Corridors. American Planning Association.

Bonsignore, R. A., C. R. Brown, B. Fitzsimons, T. A. Hammerberg, W. R. Morrish, and L. M. Neckar. "Building Community Across the Corridor: A New Parkway Model for Chanhassen, MN." Design Center for American Urban Landscape. University of Minnesota. 1992.

Cape Cod Commission. Old King's Highway/Route 6A, Corridor Management Plan. April 1, 1995.

Capitol Region Council of Governments. Corridor Management & Improvement Plans: Scope of Work. Hartford, Connecticut. October 27, 1994.

Chattanooga/Hamilton County Regional Planning Agency. The Transportation Land Use Link, Position Paper/Walter Kulash: Speaker, November 96 TDI. March 1997.

CH2M HILL. U.S. 14-IL 173 Bypass; Harvard Hills Road Extension. May 1997.

CH2M HILL Study Team. Heart of Illinois Highway Feasibility Study, Executive Summary. September 1995.

City Planning & Development Department, Planning and Urban Design Division. Blue Ridge Corridor Plan. October 1990.

City of Durham, North Carolina. Section 24-4.D.5. Major Transportation Corridor. City Ordinance.

Denver Regional Council of Governments, Regional Transportation District, and Colorado Department of Transportation. East, West, and Southeast Corridor Major Investment Studies: Guidance Manual for Technical Analysis. June 1997.

Florida Department of Transportation. East-West Multimodal Corridor Study and Miami Intermodal Center Study, Major Investment Studies. August 1, 1995.

Johnson, Donna Franklin, and William E. Issel. "Three for the Road." *Planning*. May 1989. Pp. 17-22.

JRH Transportation Engineering. Oregon Highway 42 Corridor Strategy, Oregon Department of Transportation Region 3, 3500 N.W. Stewart Parkway, Roseburg, Oregon 97470.

JRH Transportation Engineering. Transportation Corridor Study, Coos Bay to Roseburg Corridor Strategy, Oregon Department of Transportation.

Lehr & Associates, Inc. Draft Policy Implement, State of Delaware Department of Transportation, Subject: State Access Management Policy. Trenton, NJ. July 1997.

Maiorana, John J. "Preserving Transportation Corridors." *TR News*. Vol. 187. December 1996. Pp. 18-21.

Martin, Larry, and Paula Green. "Gaining Project Acceptance." *Civil Engineering*. August 1995.

North Carolina Department of Transportation. Thoroughfare Plan for the City of Morganton. February 1997.

North Carolina Department of Transportation. Phase 1 Environmental Study, Implementation Guidelines. 1996.

Oregon Department of Transportation, CH2M HILL, and Jeanne Lawson Associates. Portland to Lincoln City Corridor, Oregon Highways 99W and 18, I-5 to U.S. 101, Interim Corridor Strategy. March 1997.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Corridor Planning. World Wide Web Site. <<http://www.odot.state.or.us/tdb/planning/corridor/purpose.html>>. July 3, 1996.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Final Draft Oregon Highway 82 Corridor Plan, Transportation Improvement and Management Element Capital Improvement Decisions. November 15, 1996.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Corridor Overview. Draft Document. May 1994.

Otak, Pacific Rim Resources, and Kittelson and Associates. Oregon Highway 82 Corridor Strategy, La Grande - Wallowa Lake.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Draft Oregon Highway 82 Corridor Plan, Technical Appendix. June 30, 1997.

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., et al. Oregon Coast Highway Corridor Master Plan. November 1994.

Rhees, Suzanne Sutro. "Zoning the Interchange." *Zoning News*. American Planning Association. December 1993.

Rivkin, Malcolm D., and Goldie W. Rivkin. "Transportation Corridor Preservation." *Urban Land*. November 1993. Pp. 24-28.

State of Alaska Department of Transportation. Appendix B, Statement of Services, Southeast Alaska Transportation Plan. November 15, 1996.

State of California Department of Transportation. Route Concept Report Guidelines. December 1997.

State of California Department of Transportation. Transportation Concept Report, Interstate 8. November 1996.

State of California Department of Transportation. Transportation Planning Program. System Planning Final Guidance for Transportation System Development Program. Memorandum to District Division Chiefs Planning and Public Transportation. March 30, 1995.

State of California Department of Transportation. System Planning—Interim Instructions. November 3, 1994.

State of California Department of Transportation. District System Management Plan: Guidelines. July 1991.

State of Illinois Department of Transportation. Illinois Bureau of Design and Environment Manual. July 1995.

Tom Hudson Company. Northwest Passage, Clearwater Canyons Scenic Byway, Corridor Management Plan. February 1997.

US 301 Transportation Study Task Force. US 301 Transportation Study Final Report. November 1996.

Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Transit Administration. Milwaukee East-West Corridor Transportation Study, Major Investment Study/Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Executive Summary. May 1, 1997.

Glossary of Terms

Arterials	A high level of traffic mobility and a low level of access to land.
Collectors	Medium level traffic mobility and medium level of access to land.
Corridor	A broad geographic area, defined by logical, existing and forecasted travel patterns served by various modal transportation systems that provide important connections within and between regions of the state for people, goods, and services. Travel within the corridor may include vehicular, rail, transit, water, air, or nonmotorized.
Corridor Plan	Document that defines a comprehensive package of recommendations for managing and improving the transportation system within and along a specific corridor, based on a 20-year planning horizon.
Corridor Planning	A process to develop a corridor plan that is collaborative with local governments and includes extensive public participation opportunities.
Corridor Preservation	The identification and protection of highway corridors or the path of a new or existing highway needed for future construction.
Functional Classification	<p>The process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of service they are intended to provide.</p> <p>Basic to this process is the recognition that individual roads do not serve travel independently in any major way. Rather, most travel involves movement through a network of roads. It becomes necessary, then, to determine how this travel can be channelized within the network in a logical and efficient manner. Functional classification defines the nature of this channelization process by defining the part that any particular road or street should play in serving the flow of trips through a highway network.</p> <p>Allied to the idea of traffic channelization is the dual role the highway network plays in providing access to property and traffic mobility. Highways are grouped into arterials, collectors, or locals. Further distinctions can be made (rural, urban, major, minor, etc.). For a more comprehensive discussion, see Highway Functional Classification: Concepts Criteria and Procedures (FHWA, 1989).</p>

Goals	These are typically measurable, adopted goals that are created in response to a Corridor Plan's statement of need. They prescribe standards that the future transportation system should meet. For example, "By the Year 2010, 20 miles of bicycle lanes will be added to the existing system," or "The level of service on Highway Z will be maintained at its current level." The corridor plan's recommended alternatives are expected to meet the goals for the corridor.
Intermodal	Refers to the connections between transportation modes.
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
Local	Local roads or streets that have a low level of traffic mobility and a high level of land access. In addition to functional classification this phrase may also refer to local government having jurisdiction for a highway or system.
Local Highway Jurisdiction	Refers to any City, County, or Highway District that has jurisdiction over a highway system.
Metropolitan Planning Organization	The organization designated to carry out the transportation planning process for metropolitan areas, according to 23 USC 134.
Mode	Refers to the infrastructure or the form of transporting goods or people: aviation; highway; automobile and small truck; bicycle; transit (bus, van); large truck (freight); pedestrian; rail; and waterways (barge, ferry).
Multimodal	Refers to the availability of transportation options within a system or corridor.
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
Private Transit	Refers to any transportation service where all of the service is privately funded, typically jitney or shuttle systems.
Public Participation	A collaborative process that encourages stakeholders to participate in the plan's formation and, ultimately, conclusion. Public involvement typically comes from outreach, data-gathering, and participation.
Public Transit	Refers to any transit service where all or part of the service is publicly funded. Services can range from fixed route, route deviation, and vanpool.
Public Transportation	Refers to any transportation service where all or part of the service is publicly funded, typically limited to local bus systems or paratransit.

Shuttle	Usually a service provided with an up-to-20 passenger vehicle connecting major trip destinations and origins on a fixed- or route-deviation basis. Shuttles can provide feeder services to main transit routes, or operate in a point-to-point or circular fashion.
Stakeholders	The term refers to groups or their representatives having an interest (stake) in the outcome of the corridor planning process. Typical stakeholders include elected officials, planning and zoning commissioners, metropolitan planning organizations, sewer districts, utility companies, business interests, agencies, and neighborhood associations.
Transit	Refers to passenger service, typically with a seating capacity of more than seven persons including the driver, and provided to the general public at published fares.
Transportation Alternatives Analysis	This technology compares possible courses of action to resolve a transportation issue using one or more criteria or factors. ISTEA requires alternatives analysis at the major investment study (MIS) level of project development. NEPA requires such analysis in the environmental impact statement (EIS) or environmental assessment (EA) process. The process by which possible solutions are compared, including the criteria employed, the measures of the criteria applied, and the results of the comparison presented, has substantial impact on the quality of the ultimate project selection. In fact, such alternatives analysis is usually the bridge between the technical project aspects and political decision making.
Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	The primary product of implementing a TDM program should be reduced peak period traffic congestion and air pollution. TDM programs include a variety of employer-provided incentives aimed at inducing commuters to rideshare, use transit, walk, or bicycle to work. Incentives include preferential parking, matching services, bicycle facilities, and award programs.
Transportation Facilities	Individual modal or multimodal conveyances and terminals such as airports (terminals, flight zone); highways (roadways, rights of way, grade separations, bridges); rail (terminals, freight yards); waterways (ports, harbor); transit stations; and bicycle paths.
Transportation Services	Refer to the form of transporting goods or people: aviation, automobile, small truck, bicycle, transit (bus, van), large truck (freight), rail, barge, and ferry.

**Transportation Systems
Management (TSM)**

Cooperative development and implementation of strategies to maximize the safe movement of people and goods by managing an integrated multimodal transportation system. The effective management of the system will enable the traveling public more efficient use of the existing transportation facilities. Elements of TSM include incident management programs, traveler information systems, traffic signal systems upgrades, intermodal freight planning, surveillance control systems, demand management techniques, and commercial vehicle operations.

Example of Alternatives Screening Process

The screening process that is selected for developing each corridor plan must be simple enough for everyone to understand and participate in, and structured enough to demonstrate substantiation of the recommended choices. Such a process was used successfully in Idaho during the ITD-sponsored North Pocatello/Chubbuck Major Investment Study. This general approach would work equally well for roadway alignments and alternate mode comparisons. A description of the process is provided below.

North Pocatello/Chubbuck Major Investment Study Screening Process

As part of the North Pocatello/Chubbuck Major Investment Study process, each of the performance objectives were weighted by a factor that represented their relative importance when compared to one another. These weighting factors were developed jointly with the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the Bannock Planning Organization, the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Pocatello Metropolitan area. The CAC and TAC were then provided with the analysis of each objective for all the alternatives.

The results of this analysis ranged from numerical quantitative measures to qualitative impacts (high, medium, low). The CAC and TAC reviewed the analysis and ranked each of the alternatives from best to worst for all the performance objectives. No ties were allowed. This forced the CAC and TAC to evaluate the alternatives and provide their best judgment (with analysis provided)

regarding the alternatives' positive and negative characteristics.

The best to worst ratings were multiplied by the weighting factors to reflect the importance of each performance objective to develop an overall score for each alternative. The scores were then compared, and the best overall alternative was chosen as the preferred alternative.

This methodology, although simple, was very effective in illustrating what the important project issues were, as well as how the alternatives fared against one another in a comparison. Each of the alternatives had their good and bad attributes, but the approach provided the means to determine which was the best overall.

Additional information on the North Pocatello/Chubbuck Major Investment Study may be obtained from the Intermodal Planning section of the ITD Division of Transportation Planning.

List of Agencies

Listed below are agencies as sources for some of the data referenced in Step 3, pertaining to environmental and land use conditions. Headquarters are identified in all cases, along with district addresses where available. Check with the headquarters offices to find out if there are district offices that can best meet your needs.

STATE AGENCIES

Idaho Fish and Game

Wildlife and Fish Resources

Regional Offices

Headquarters

600 S. Walnut

P.O. Box 25

Boise, ID 83707

(208) 334-3700

Panhandle Region

2750 Kathleen Avenue

Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

(208) 769-1414

Clearwater Region

1540 Warner Avenue

Lewiston, ID 83501

(208) 799-5010

Southwest Region

3101 S. Powerline Road

Nampa, ID 83686

(208) 465-8465

(208) 887-6729

McCall

555 Deinhard Lane

McCall, ID 83638

(208) 634-8137

Magic Valley Region

868 East Main Street

P.O. Box 428

Jerome, ID 83338

(208) 324-4350

Southeast Region

1345 Barton Road

Pocatello, ID 83204

(208) 232-4703

Upper Snake Region

1515 Lincoln Road

Idaho Falls, ID 83401

(208) 525-7290

Salmon Region

1214 Hwy 93 N.

P.O. Box 1336

Salmon, ID 83467

(208) 756-2271

Fish and Wildlife Issues

Scott Grunder

3101 S. Powerline Road

Nampa, ID 83686

(208) 887-6729

Idaho Department of Water Resources

Water Resource Issues

Gene Gibson

2735 Airport Way

Boise, ID 83705

(208) 334-2190

Flood Plain Coordinator

1301 N. Orchard

Boise, ID 83706

(208) 327-7993

Streams and Water Quality

IDWR State office

1301 North Orchard Street

Boise, ID 83706

(208) 327-7900

IDWR Northern Regional office
1910 Northwest Blvd., Suite 210
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814-2615
(208) 769-1450

IDWR Western Regional office
2735 Airport Way
Boise, ID 83705-5082
(208) 334-2190

IDWR Southern Regional office
1341 Fillmore St., Suite 200
Twin Falls, ID 83301-3380
(208) 736-3033

IDWR Eastern Regional Office
900 North Skyline Drive
Idaho Falls, ID 83402-6105
(208) 525-7161

IDWR Salmon office
Van Dreff Office Complex, Suite B
Salmon, ID 83467
(208) 756-6644

Idaho Division of Environmental Quality

Air & Water Quality Contacts (3.9.98)

IDEQ-Coeur d'Alene Regional Office
2110 Ironwood Parkway
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

Air Dan Redline
(208) 769-1422-Voice
(208) 769-1404-Fax
dredline@deq.state.id.us

Water Jack Skille
(208) 769-1422-Voice
(208) 769-1404-Fax
jskille@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Lewiston Regional Office
1118 F Street
Lewiston, ID 83501

Air Bob Jeffries
(208) 799-4370-Voice
(208) 799-3451-Fax
bjeffrie@deq.state.id.us

Water John Cardwell
(208) 799-4370-Voice
(208) 799-3451-Fax
jcardwel@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Boise Regional Office
1445 North Orchard
Boise, ID 83706-2239

Air Alison Miller-Gonzalez
(208) 373-0550-Voice
(208) 373-0287-Fax
amiller@deq.state.id.us

Water Craig Shepard
(208) 373-0550-Voice
(208) 373-0287-Fax
cshepard@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Twin Falls Regional Office
601 Pole Line Road, Suite 2
Twin Falls, ID 83301

Air Steve VanZandt
(208) 736-2190-Voice
(208) 736-2194-Fax
svanzand@deq.state.id.us

Water Darren Brandt
(208) 736-2190-Voice
(208) 736-2194-Fax
dbrandt@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Pocatello Regional Office
224 South Arthur
Pocatello, ID 83204

Air Audrey Cole
(208) 236-6160-Voice
(208) 236-6168-Fax
acole@deq.state.id.us

Water Lynn Van Every
(208) 236-6160-Voice
(208) 236-6168-Fax
lvanever@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Idaho Falls Regional Office
900 Skyline, Suite B
Idaho Falls, ID 83402

Air Catherine Reno
(208) 528-2650-Voice
(208) 528-2695-Fax
creno@deq.state.id.us

Water Chris Mebane
(208) 528-2650-Voice
(208) 528-2695-Fax
cmebane@deq.state.id.us

OTHER STATE AGENCIES

Parks and Park Development

Idaho State Parks and Recreation
5657 Warm Springs Avenue
Boise, ID
(208) 334-4199

State Lands Managed for State Endowment

Idaho Department of Lands
954 W. Jefferson
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0050
(208) 334-0200

Population Statistics

Idaho State Department of Commerce
700 West State Street
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0093
(208) 334-2470

FEDERAL

Threatened and Endangered Species

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
4696 Overland Road
Boise, ID 83705
(208) 334-1931

Prime Agriculture Land

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
State Conservationist Office
3244 Elder Street
Boise, ID 83705
(208) 378-5700

Lands Information and Maps

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Idaho State Office
1387 Vinnell Way
Boise, ID
(208) 373-4000

Environmental Issues

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
422 W. Washington
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-9488

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Offices

Wetlands and Waterways

Corps of Engineers
Coeur d'Alene Regulatory Office
Idaho Panhandle National Forest
3815 Schreiber Way
Coeur d'Alene, ID, 83814-8363
(208) 765-7237

Corps of Engineers
Boise Regulatory Office
Lucky Peak Project Office
HC-33, Box 1020
Boise, ID 83706-9302
(208) 343-0671

Corps of Engineers
Idaho Falls Regulatory Office
Exchange Plaza
1820 East 17th , Suite 350
Idaho Falls, ID 83404
(208) 522-1645

District Office
Corps of Engineers
Walla Walla District
Regulatory Branch
201 North 3rd Street
Walla Walla, WA 99362
(509) 527-7150

Regional Archaeological Centers

Archaeological Survey of Idaho, Northern
Repository
Laboratory of Anthropology
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83843
(208) 885-6123

Archaeological Survey of Idaho, Western
Repository
Idaho State Historical Society
210 Main Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-3847

Archaeological Survey of Idaho, Eastern
Repository
Museum of Natural History
Box 8096
Idaho State University
Pocatello, ID 83209
(208) 236-3131

State Historic and Cultural Resources

State Highway Archaeologist
Idaho Transportation Department
P.O. Box 7129
Boise, ID 83707
(208) 334-8479

State Historic Preservation Office
Idaho State Historical Society
210 Main Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-3861

Tribal Contacts

Northwestern Band, Shoshone
31 West Bridge
P.O. Box 637

Blackfoot, ID 83221
(208) 785-7401

Kootenai Tribal Council
P.O. Box 1269
Bonners Ferry, ID 83805
(208) 267-3519

Shoshone-Paiute Tribes
P.O. Box 219
Owyhee, NV 89832
(208) 757-3161

Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Idaho
Tribal Headquarters
Plummer, ID 83851
(208) 686-1800

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
P.O. Box 306
Fort Hall, ID 83203
(208) 238-3700

Nez Perce Tribe
P.O. Box 365
Lapwai, ID 83540
(208) 843-2253

Metropolitan Planning Organizations

Ada Planning Association
413 W. Idaho #100
Boise, ID 83702-6064
(208) 345-5274

Bannock Planning Organization
214 E. Center
Pocatello, ID 83201
(208) 233-9322

Bonneville Metropolitan Planning Organization
City of Idaho Falls
380 Constitution Way
Idaho Falls, ID 83405-0220
(208) 528-5530

Regional Planning Organizations

Region I

Panhandle Area Council
11100 Airport Drive
Hayden, ID 83835
(208) 772-0584

Region II

Clearwater Economic Development
Association
1626 6th Avenue N.
Lewiston, ID 83501
(208) 746-0015

Region III

Ida-Ore Planning & Development Association,
Inc.
10624 W. Executive Drive
Boise, ID 83704
(208) 322-7033/(800) 859-0321

Region IV

Region IV Development Assn.
315 Falls Ave.
P.O. Box 1844
Twin Falls, ID 83303
(208) 736-3064

Region V

Southeast Idaho Council of
Governments, Inc.
280 S. Arthur
Pocatello, ID 83201
(208) 233-4032

Region VI

East Central Idaho Planning
& Development Assn.
310 North 2nd East
Rexburg, ID 83440
(208) 356-4524

Bear Lake Regional Commission

Bear Lake Regional Commission
P.O. Box 26
2661 U.S. 89
Fish Haven, ID 83287
(208) 945-2333

OTHER AGENCIES

Local Highway Technical Assistance Council
1436 Bannock Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 344-0565

Idaho Association of Highway
Districts, Inc.
1436 Bannock Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 345-5176

Idaho Association of Counties
700 West Washington
P.O. Box 1623
Boise, ID 83701
(208) 345-9126

Association of Idaho Cities
3314 Grace Street
Boise, ID 83703
(208) 344-8594

Reference Materials

Arizona Department of Transportation: Transportation Planning Group. State Route 77 Tucson to Holbrook, Corridor Profile Review, Scope of Work. 1995.

Arkansas State Highway Commission. Agreement for Engineering and Environmental Services. State Job No. 001747, FAP No. DPS-A015(7). April 9, 1995.

Bevan, Timothy A. Planning Procedures and Requirements for Highway Corridor Studies. Compendium of Technical Papers. Institute of Transportation Engineers District 6 Annual Meeting. Anchorage, Alaska. July 1992.

Bishop, Kirk R. Designing Urban Corridors. American Planning Association.

Bonsignore, R. A., C. R. Brown, B. Fitzsimons, T. A. Hammerberg, W. R. Morrish, and L. M. Neckar. "Building Community Across the Corridor: A New Parkway Model for Chanhassen, MN." Design Center for American Urban Landscape. University of Minnesota. 1992.

Cape Cod Commission. Old King's Highway/Route 6A, Corridor Management Plan. April 1, 1995.

Capitol Region Council of Governments. Corridor Management & Improvement Plans: Scope of Work. Hartford, Connecticut. October 27, 1994.

Chattanooga/Hamilton County Regional Planning Agency. The Transportation Land Use Link, Position Paper/Walter Kulash: Speaker, November 96 TDI. March 1997.

CH2M HILL. U.S. 14-IL 173 Bypass; Harvard Hills Road Extension. May 1997.

CH2M HILL Study Team. Heart of Illinois Highway Feasibility Study, Executive Summary. September 1995.

City Planning & Development Department, Planning and Urban Design Division. Blue Ridge Corridor Plan. October 1990.

City of Durham, North Carolina. Section 24-4.D.5. Major Transportation Corridor. City Ordinance.

Denver Regional Council of Governments, Regional Transportation District, and Colorado Department of Transportation. East, West, and Southeast Corridor Major Investment Studies: Guidance Manual for Technical Analysis. June 1997.

Florida Department of Transportation. East-West Multimodal Corridor Study and Miami Intermodal Center Study, Major Investment Studies. August 1, 1995.

Johnson, Donna Franklin, and William E. Issel. "Three for the Road." *Planning*. May 1989. Pp. 17-22.

JRH Transportation Engineering. Oregon Highway 42 Corridor Strategy, Oregon Department of Transportation Region 3, 3500 N.W. Stewart Parkway, Roseburg, Oregon 97470.

JRH Transportation Engineering. Transportation Corridor Study, Coos Bay to Roseburg Corridor Strategy, Oregon Department of Transportation.

Lehr & Associates, Inc. Draft Policy Implement, State of Delaware Department of Transportation, Subject: State Access Management Policy. Trenton, NJ. July 1997.

Maiorana, John J. "Preserving Transportation Corridors." *TR News*. Vol. 187. December 1996. Pp. 18-21.

Martin, Larry, and Paula Green. "Gaining Project Acceptance." *Civil Engineering*. August 1995.

North Carolina Department of Transportation. Thoroughfare Plan for the City of Morganton. February 1997.

North Carolina Department of Transportation. Phase 1 Environmental Study, Implementation Guidelines. 1996.

Oregon Department of Transportation, CH2M HILL, and Jeanne Lawson Associates. Portland to Lincoln City Corridor, Oregon Highways 99W and 18, I-5 to U.S. 101, Interim Corridor Strategy. March 1997.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Corridor Planning. World Wide Web Site. <<http://www.odot.state.or.us/tdb/planning/corridor/purpose.html>>. July 3, 1996.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Final Draft Oregon Highway 82 Corridor Plan, Transportation Improvement and Management Element Capital Improvement Decisions. November 15, 1996.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Corridor Overview. Draft Document. May 1994.

Otak, Pacific Rim Resources, and Kittelson and Associates. Oregon Highway 82 Corridor Strategy, La Grande - Wallowa Lake.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Draft Oregon Highway 82 Corridor Plan, Technical Appendix. June 30, 1997.

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., et al. Oregon Coast Highway Corridor Master Plan. November 1994.

Rhees, Suzanne Sutro. "Zoning the Interchange." *Zoning News*. American Planning Association. December 1993.

Rivkin, Malcolm D., and Goldie W. Rivkin. "Transportation Corridor Preservation." *Urban Land*. November 1993. Pp. 24-28.

State of Alaska Department of Transportation. Appendix B, Statement of Services, Southeast Alaska Transportation Plan. November 15, 1996.

State of California Department of Transportation. Route Concept Report Guidelines. December 1997.

State of California Department of Transportation. Transportation Concept Report, Interstate 8. November 1996.

State of California Department of Transportation. Transportation Planning Program. System Planning Final Guidance for Transportation System Development Program. Memorandum to District Division Chiefs Planning and Public Transportation. March 30, 1995.

State of California Department of Transportation. System Planning—Interim Instructions. November 3, 1994.

State of California Department of Transportation. District System Management Plan: Guidelines. July 1991.

State of Illinois Department of Transportation. Illinois Bureau of Design and Environment Manual. July 1995.

Tom Hudson Company. Northwest Passage, Clearwater Canyons Scenic Byway, Corridor Management Plan. February 1997.

US 301 Transportation Study Task Force. US 301 Transportation Study Final Report. November 1996.

Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Transit Administration. Milwaukee East-West Corridor Transportation Study, Major Investment Study/Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Executive Summary. May 1, 1997.

Glossary of Terms

Arterials	A high level of traffic mobility and a low level of access to land.
Collectors	Medium level traffic mobility and medium level of access to land.
Corridor	A broad geographic area, defined by logical, existing and forecasted travel patterns served by various modal transportation systems that provide important connections within and between regions of the state for people, goods, and services. Travel within the corridor may include vehicular, rail, transit, water, air, or nonmotorized.
Corridor Plan	Document that defines a comprehensive package of recommendations for managing and improving the transportation system within and along a specific corridor, based on a 20-year planning horizon.
Corridor Planning	A process to develop a corridor plan that is collaborative with local governments and includes extensive public participation opportunities.
Corridor Preservation	The identification and protection of highway corridors or the path of a new or existing highway needed for future construction.
Functional Classification	<p>The process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of service they are intended to provide.</p> <p>Basic to this process is the recognition that individual roads do not serve travel independently in any major way. Rather, most travel involves movement through a network of roads. It becomes necessary, then, to determine how this travel can be channelized within the network in a logical and efficient manner. Functional classification defines the nature of this channelization process by defining the part that any particular road or street should play in serving the flow of trips through a highway network.</p> <p>Allied to the idea of traffic channelization is the dual role the highway network plays in providing access to property and traffic mobility. Highways are grouped into arterials, collectors, or locals. Further distinctions can be made (rural, urban, major, minor, etc.). For a more comprehensive discussion, see Highway Functional Classification: Concepts Criteria and Procedures (FHWA, 1989).</p>

Goals	These are typically measurable, adopted goals that are created in response to a Corridor Plan's statement of need. They prescribe standards that the future transportation system should meet. For example, "By the Year 2010, 20 miles of bicycle lanes will be added to the existing system," or "The level of service on Highway Z will be maintained at its current level." The corridor plan's recommended alternatives are expected to meet the goals for the corridor.
Intermodal	Refers to the connections between transportation modes.
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
Local	Local roads or streets that have a low level of traffic mobility and a high level of land access. In addition to functional classification this phrase may also refer to local government having jurisdiction for a highway or system.
Local Highway Jurisdiction	Refers to any City, County, or Highway District that has jurisdiction over a highway system.
Metropolitan Planning Organization	The organization designated to carry out the transportation planning process for metropolitan areas, according to 23 USC 134.
Mode	Refers to the infrastructure or the form of transporting goods or people: aviation; highway; automobile and small truck; bicycle; transit (bus, van); large truck (freight); pedestrian; rail; and waterways (barge, ferry).
Multimodal	Refers to the availability of transportation options within a system or corridor.
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
Private Transit	Refers to any transportation service where all of the service is privately funded, typically jitney or shuttle systems.
Public Participation	A collaborative process that encourages stakeholders to participate in the plan's formation and, ultimately, conclusion. Public involvement typically comes from outreach, data-gathering, and participation.
Public Transit	Refers to any transit service where all or part of the service is publicly funded. Services can range from fixed route, route deviation, and vanpool.
Public Transportation	Refers to any transportation service where all or part of the service is publicly funded, typically limited to local bus systems or paratransit.

Shuttle	Usually a service provided with an up-to-20 passenger vehicle connecting major trip destinations and origins on a fixed- or route-deviation basis. Shuttles can provide feeder services to main transit routes, or operate in a point-to-point or circular fashion.
Stakeholders	The term refers to groups or their representatives having an interest (stake) in the outcome of the corridor planning process. Typical stakeholders include elected officials, planning and zoning commissioners, metropolitan planning organizations, sewer districts, utility companies, business interests, agencies, and neighborhood associations.
Transit	Refers to passenger service, typically with a seating capacity of more than seven persons including the driver, and provided to the general public at published fares.
Transportation Alternatives Analysis	This technology compares possible courses of action to resolve a transportation issue using one or more criteria or factors. ISTEA requires alternatives analysis at the major investment study (MIS) level of project development. NEPA requires such analysis in the environmental impact statement (EIS) or environmental assessment (EA) process. The process by which possible solutions are compared, including the criteria employed, the measures of the criteria applied, and the results of the comparison presented, has substantial impact on the quality of the ultimate project selection. In fact, such alternatives analysis is usually the bridge between the technical project aspects and political decision making.
Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	The primary product of implementing a TDM program should be reduced peak period traffic congestion and air pollution. TDM programs include a variety of employer-provided incentives aimed at inducing commuters to rideshare, use transit, walk, or bicycle to work. Incentives include preferential parking, matching services, bicycle facilities, and award programs.
Transportation Facilities	Individual modal or multimodal conveyances and terminals such as airports (terminals, flight zone); highways (roadways, rights of way, grade separations, bridges); rail (terminals, freight yards); waterways (ports, harbor); transit stations; and bicycle paths.
Transportation Services	Refer to the form of transporting goods or people: aviation, automobile, small truck, bicycle, transit (bus, van), large truck (freight), rail, barge, and ferry.

**Transportation Systems
Management (TSM)**

Cooperative development and implementation of strategies to maximize the safe movement of people and goods by managing an integrated multimodal transportation system. The effective management of the system will enable the traveling public more efficient use of the existing transportation facilities. Elements of TSM include incident management programs, traveler information systems, traffic signal systems upgrades, intermodal freight planning, surveillance control systems, demand management techniques, and commercial vehicle operations.

List of Agencies

Listed below are agencies as sources for some of the data referenced in Step 3, pertaining to environmental and land use conditions. Headquarters are identified in all cases, along with district addresses where available. Check with the headquarters offices to find out if there are district offices that can best meet your needs.

STATE AGENCIES

Idaho Fish and Game

Wildlife and Fish Resources

Regional Offices

Headquarters

600 S. Walnut

P.O. Box 25

Boise, ID 83707

(208) 334-3700

Panhandle Region

2750 Kathleen Avenue

Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

(208) 769-1414

Clearwater Region

1540 Warner Avenue

Lewiston, ID 83501

(208) 799-5010

Southwest Region

3101 S. Powerline Road

Nampa, ID 83686

(208) 465-8465

(208) 887-6729

McCall

555 Deinhard Lane

McCall, ID 83638

(208) 634-8137

Magic Valley Region

868 East Main Street

P.O. Box 428

Jerome, ID 83338

(208) 324-4350

Southeast Region

1345 Barton Road

Pocatello, ID 83204

(208) 232-4703

Upper Snake Region

1515 Lincoln Road

Idaho Falls, ID 83401

(208) 525-7290

Salmon Region

1214 Hwy 93 N.

P.O. Box 1336

Salmon, ID 83467

(208) 756-2271

Fish and Wildlife Issues

Scott Grunder

3101 S. Powerline Road

Nampa, ID 83686

(208) 887-6729

Idaho Department of Water Resources

Water Resource Issues

Gene Gibson

2735 Airport Way

Boise, ID 83705

(208) 334-2190

Flood Plain Coordinator

1301 N. Orchard

Boise, ID 83706

(208) 327-7993

Streams and Water Quality

IDWR State office

1301 North Orchard Street

Boise, ID 83706

(208) 327-7900

IDWR Northern Regional office
1910 Northwest Blvd., Suite 210
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814-2615
(208) 769-1450

IDWR Western Regional office
2735 Airport Way
Boise, ID 83705-5082
(208) 334-2190

IDWR Southern Regional office
1341 Fillmore St., Suite 200
Twin Falls, ID 83301-3380
(208) 736-3033

IDWR Eastern Regional Office
900 North Skyline Drive
Idaho Falls, ID 83402-6105
(208) 525-7161

IDWR Salmon office
Van Dreff Office Complex, Suite B
Salmon, ID 83467
(208) 756-6644

Idaho Division of Environmental Quality

Air & Water Quality Contacts (3.9.98)

IDEQ-Coeur d'Alene Regional Office
2110 Ironwood Parkway
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

Air Dan Redline
(208) 769-1422-Voice
(208) 769-1404-Fax
dredline@deq.state.id.us

Water Jack Skille
(208) 769-1422-Voice
(208) 769-1404-Fax
jskille@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Lewiston Regional Office
1118 F Street
Lewiston, ID 83501

Air Bob Jeffries
(208) 799-4370-Voice
(208) 799-3451-Fax
bjeffrie@deq.state.id.us

Water John Cardwell
(208) 799-4370-Voice
(208) 799-3451-Fax
jcardwel@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Boise Regional Office
1445 North Orchard
Boise, ID 83706-2239

Air Alison Miller-Gonzalez
(208) 373-0550-Voice
(208) 373-0287-Fax
amiller@deq.state.id.us

Water Craig Shepard
(208) 373-0550-Voice
(208) 373-0287-Fax
cshepard@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Twin Falls Regional Office
601 Pole Line Road, Suite 2
Twin Falls, ID 83301

Air Steve VanZandt
(208) 736-2190-Voice
(208) 736-2194-Fax
svanzand@deq.state.id.us

Water Darren Brandt
(208) 736-2190-Voice
(208) 736-2194-Fax
dbrandt@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Pocatello Regional Office
224 South Arthur
Pocatello, ID 83204

Air Audrey Cole
(208) 236-6160-Voice
(208) 236-6168-Fax
acole@deq.state.id.us

Water Lynn Van Every
(208) 236-6160-Voice
(208) 236-6168-Fax
lvanever@deq.state.id.us

IDEQ-Idaho Falls Regional Office
900 Skyline, Suite B
Idaho Falls, ID 83402

Air Catherine Reno
(208) 528-2650-Voice
(208) 528-2695-Fax
creno@deq.state.id.us

Water Chris Mebane
(208) 528-2650-Voice
(208) 528-2695-Fax
cmebane@deq.state.id.us

OTHER STATE AGENCIES

Parks and Park Development

Idaho State Parks and Recreation
5657 Warm Springs Avenue
Boise, ID
(208) 334-4199

State Lands Managed for State Endowment

Idaho Department of Lands
954 W. Jefferson
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0050
(208) 334-0200

Population Statistics

Idaho State Department of Commerce
700 West State Street
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0093
(208) 334-2470

FEDERAL

Threatened and Endangered Species

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
4696 Overland Road
Boise, ID 83705
(208) 334-1931

Prime Agriculture Land

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
State Conservationist Office
3244 Elder Street
Boise, ID 83705
(208) 378-5700

Lands Information and Maps

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Idaho State Office
1387 Vinnell Way
Boise, ID
(208) 373-4000

Environmental Issues

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
422 W. Washington
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-9488

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Offices

Wetlands and Waterways

Corps of Engineers
Coeur d'Alene Regulatory Office
Idaho Panhandle National Forest
3815 Schreiber Way
Coeur d'Alene, ID, 83814-8363
(208) 765-7237

Corps of Engineers
Boise Regulatory Office
Lucky Peak Project Office
HC-33, Box 1020
Boise, ID 83706-9302
(208) 343-0671

Corps of Engineers
Idaho Falls Regulatory Office
Exchange Plaza
1820 East 17th , Suite 350
Idaho Falls, ID 83404
(208) 522-1645

District Office
Corps of Engineers
Walla Walla District
Regulatory Branch
201 North 3rd Street
Walla Walla, WA 99362
(509) 527-7150

Regional Archaeological Centers

Archaeological Survey of Idaho, Northern
Repository
Laboratory of Anthropology
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83843
(208) 885-6123

Archaeological Survey of Idaho, Western
Repository
Idaho State Historical Society
210 Main Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-3847

Archaeological Survey of Idaho, Eastern
Repository
Museum of Natural History
Box 8096
Idaho State University
Pocatello, ID 83209
(208) 236-3131

State Historic and Cultural Resources

State Highway Archaeologist
Idaho Transportation Department
P.O. Box 7129
Boise, ID 83707
(208) 334-8479

State Historic Preservation Office
Idaho State Historical Society
210 Main Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-3861

Tribal Contacts

Northwestern Band, Shoshone
31 West Bridge
P.O. Box 637

Blackfoot, ID 83221
(208) 785-7401

Kootenai Tribal Council
P.O. Box 1269
Bonners Ferry, ID 83805
(208) 267-3519

Shoshone-Paiute Tribes
P.O. Box 219
Owyhee, NV 89832
(208) 757-3161

Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Idaho
Tribal Headquarters
Plummer, ID 83851
(208) 686-1800

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
P.O. Box 306
Fort Hall, ID 83203
(208) 238-3700

Nez Perce Tribe
P.O. Box 365
Lapwai, ID 83540
(208) 843-2253

Metropolitan Planning Organizations

Ada Planning Association
413 W. Idaho #100
Boise, ID 83702-6064
(208) 345-5274

Bannock Planning Organization
214 E. Center
Pocatello, ID 83201
(208) 233-9322

Bonneville Metropolitan Planning Organization
City of Idaho Falls
380 Constitution Way
Idaho Falls, ID 83405-0220
(208) 528-5530

Regional Planning Organizations

Region I

Panhandle Area Council
11100 Airport Drive
Hayden, ID 83835
(208) 772-0584

Region II

Clearwater Economic Development
Association
1626 6th Avenue N.
Lewiston, ID 83501
(208) 746-0015

Region III

Ida-Ore Planning & Development Association,
Inc.
10624 W. Executive Drive
Boise, ID 83704
(208) 322-7033/(800) 859-0321

Region IV

Region IV Development Assn.
315 Falls Ave.
P.O. Box 1844
Twin Falls, ID 83303
(208) 736-3064

Region V

Southeast Idaho Council of
Governments, Inc.
280 S. Arthur
Pocatello, ID 83201
(208) 233-4032

Region VI

East Central Idaho Planning
& Development Assn.
310 North 2nd East
Rexburg, ID 83440
(208) 356-4524

Bear Lake Regional Commission

Bear Lake Regional Commission
P.O. Box 26
2661 U.S. 89
Fish Haven, ID 83287
(208) 945-2333

OTHER AGENCIES

Local Highway Technical Assistance Council
1436 Bannock Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 344-0565

Idaho Association of Highway
Districts, Inc.
1436 Bannock Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 345-5176

Idaho Association of Counties
700 West Washington
P.O. Box 1623
Boise, ID 83701
(208) 345-9126

Association of Idaho Cities
3314 Grace Street
Boise, ID 83703
(208) 344-8594

Reference Materials

Arizona Department of Transportation: Transportation Planning Group. State Route 77 Tucson to Holbrook, Corridor Profile Review, Scope of Work. 1995.

Arkansas State Highway Commission. Agreement for Engineering and Environmental Services. State Job No. 001747, FAP No. DPS-A015(7). April 9, 1995.

Bevan, Timothy A. Planning Procedures and Requirements for Highway Corridor Studies. Compendium of Technical Papers. Institute of Transportation Engineers District 6 Annual Meeting. Anchorage, Alaska. July 1992.

Bishop, Kirk R. Designing Urban Corridors. American Planning Association.

Bonsignore, R. A., C. R. Brown, B. Fitzsimons, T. A. Hammerberg, W. R. Morrish, and L. M. Neckar. "Building Community Across the Corridor: A New Parkway Model for Chanhassen, MN." Design Center for American Urban Landscape. University of Minnesota. 1992.

Cape Cod Commission. Old King's Highway/Route 6A, Corridor Management Plan. April 1, 1995.

Capitol Region Council of Governments. Corridor Management & Improvement Plans: Scope of Work. Hartford, Connecticut. October 27, 1994.

Chattanooga/Hamilton County Regional Planning Agency. The Transportation Land Use Link, Position Paper/Walter Kulash: Speaker, November 96 TDI. March 1997.

CH2M HILL. U.S. 14-IL 173 Bypass; Harvard Hills Road Extension. May 1997.

CH2M HILL Study Team. Heart of Illinois Highway Feasibility Study, Executive Summary. September 1995.

City Planning & Development Department, Planning and Urban Design Division. Blue Ridge Corridor Plan. October 1990.

City of Durham, North Carolina. Section 24-4.D.5. Major Transportation Corridor. City Ordinance.

Denver Regional Council of Governments, Regional Transportation District, and Colorado Department of Transportation. East, West, and Southeast Corridor Major Investment Studies: Guidance Manual for Technical Analysis. June 1997.

Florida Department of Transportation. East-West Multimodal Corridor Study and Miami Intermodal Center Study, Major Investment Studies. August 1, 1995.

Johnson, Donna Franklin, and William E. Issel. "Three for the Road." *Planning*. May 1989. Pp. 17-22.

JRH Transportation Engineering. Oregon Highway 42 Corridor Strategy, Oregon Department of Transportation Region 3, 3500 N.W. Stewart Parkway, Roseburg, Oregon 97470.

JRH Transportation Engineering. Transportation Corridor Study, Coos Bay to Roseburg Corridor Strategy, Oregon Department of Transportation.

Lehr & Associates, Inc. Draft Policy Implement, State of Delaware Department of Transportation, Subject: State Access Management Policy. Trenton, NJ. July 1997.

Maiorana, John J. "Preserving Transportation Corridors." *TR News*. Vol. 187. December 1996. Pp. 18-21.

Martin, Larry, and Paula Green. "Gaining Project Acceptance." *Civil Engineering*. August 1995.

North Carolina Department of Transportation. Thoroughfare Plan for the City of Morganton. February 1997.

North Carolina Department of Transportation. Phase 1 Environmental Study, Implementation Guidelines. 1996.

Oregon Department of Transportation, CH2M HILL, and Jeanne Lawson Associates. Portland to Lincoln City Corridor, Oregon Highways 99W and 18, I-5 to U.S. 101, Interim Corridor Strategy. March 1997.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Corridor Planning. World Wide Web Site. <<http://www.odot.state.or.us/tdb/planning/corridor/purpose.html>>. July 3, 1996.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Final Draft Oregon Highway 82 Corridor Plan, Transportation Improvement and Management Element Capital Improvement Decisions. November 15, 1996.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Corridor Overview. Draft Document. May 1994.

Otak, Pacific Rim Resources, and Kittelson and Associates. Oregon Highway 82 Corridor Strategy, La Grande - Wallowa Lake.

Oregon Department of Transportation. Draft Oregon Highway 82 Corridor Plan, Technical Appendix. June 30, 1997.

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., et al. Oregon Coast Highway Corridor Master Plan. November 1994.

Rhees, Suzanne Sutro. "Zoning the Interchange." *Zoning News*. American Planning Association. December 1993.

Rivkin, Malcolm D., and Goldie W. Rivkin. "Transportation Corridor Preservation." *Urban Land*. November 1993. Pp. 24-28.

State of Alaska Department of Transportation. Appendix B, Statement of Services, Southeast Alaska Transportation Plan. November 15, 1996.

State of California Department of Transportation. Route Concept Report Guidelines. December 1997.

State of California Department of Transportation. Transportation Concept Report, Interstate 8. November 1996.

State of California Department of Transportation. Transportation Planning Program. System Planning Final Guidance for Transportation System Development Program. Memorandum to District Division Chiefs Planning and Public Transportation. March 30, 1995.

State of California Department of Transportation. System Planning—Interim Instructions. November 3, 1994.

State of California Department of Transportation. District System Management Plan: Guidelines. July 1991.

State of Illinois Department of Transportation. Illinois Bureau of Design and Environment Manual. July 1995.

Tom Hudson Company. Northwest Passage, Clearwater Canyons Scenic Byway, Corridor Management Plan. February 1997.

US 301 Transportation Study Task Force. US 301 Transportation Study Final Report. November 1996.

Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Transit Administration. Milwaukee East-West Corridor Transportation Study, Major Investment Study/Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Executive Summary. May 1, 1997.

Glossary of Terms

Arterials	A high level of traffic mobility and a low level of access to land.
Collectors	Medium level traffic mobility and medium level of access to land.
Corridor	A broad geographic area, defined by logical, existing and forecasted travel patterns served by various modal transportation systems that provide important connections within and between regions of the state for people, goods, and services. Travel within the corridor may include vehicular, rail, transit, water, air, or nonmotorized.
Corridor Plan	Document that defines a comprehensive package of recommendations for managing and improving the transportation system within and along a specific corridor, based on a 20-year planning horizon.
Corridor Planning	A process to develop a corridor plan that is collaborative with local governments and includes extensive public participation opportunities.
Corridor Preservation	The identification and protection of highway corridors or the path of a new or existing highway needed for future construction.
Functional Classification	<p>The process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of service they are intended to provide.</p> <p>Basic to this process is the recognition that individual roads do not serve travel independently in any major way. Rather, most travel involves movement through a network of roads. It becomes necessary, then, to determine how this travel can be channelized within the network in a logical and efficient manner. Functional classification defines the nature of this channelization process by defining the part that any particular road or street should play in serving the flow of trips through a highway network.</p> <p>Allied to the idea of traffic channelization is the dual role the highway network plays in providing access to property and traffic mobility. Highways are grouped into arterials, collectors, or locals. Further distinctions can be made (rural, urban, major, minor, etc.). For a more comprehensive discussion, see Highway Functional Classification: Concepts Criteria and Procedures (FHWA, 1989).</p>

Goals	These are typically measurable, adopted goals that are created in response to a Corridor Plan's statement of need. They prescribe standards that the future transportation system should meet. For example, "By the Year 2010, 20 miles of bicycle lanes will be added to the existing system," or "The level of service on Highway Z will be maintained at its current level." The corridor plan's recommended alternatives are expected to meet the goals for the corridor.
Intermodal	Refers to the connections between transportation modes.
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
Local	Local roads or streets that have a low level of traffic mobility and a high level of land access. In addition to functional classification this phrase may also refer to local government having jurisdiction for a highway or system.
Local Highway Jurisdiction	Refers to any City, County, or Highway District that has jurisdiction over a highway system.
Metropolitan Planning Organization	The organization designated to carry out the transportation planning process for metropolitan areas, according to 23 USC 134.
Mode	Refers to the infrastructure or the form of transporting goods or people: aviation; highway; automobile and small truck; bicycle; transit (bus, van); large truck (freight); pedestrian; rail; and waterways (barge, ferry).
Multimodal	Refers to the availability of transportation options within a system or corridor.
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
Private Transit	Refers to any transportation service where all of the service is privately funded, typically jitney or shuttle systems.
Public Participation	A collaborative process that encourages stakeholders to participate in the plan's formation and, ultimately, conclusion. Public involvement typically comes from outreach, data-gathering, and participation.
Public Transit	Refers to any transit service where all or part of the service is publicly funded. Services can range from fixed route, route deviation, and vanpool.
Public Transportation	Refers to any transportation service where all or part of the service is publicly funded, typically limited to local bus systems or paratransit.

Shuttle	Usually a service provided with an up-to-20 passenger vehicle connecting major trip destinations and origins on a fixed- or route-deviation basis. Shuttles can provide feeder services to main transit routes, or operate in a point-to-point or circular fashion.
Stakeholders	The term refers to groups or their representatives having an interest (stake) in the outcome of the corridor planning process. Typical stakeholders include elected officials, planning and zoning commissioners, metropolitan planning organizations, sewer districts, utility companies, business interests, agencies, and neighborhood associations.
Transit	Refers to passenger service, typically with a seating capacity of more than seven persons including the driver, and provided to the general public at published fares.
Transportation Alternatives Analysis	This technology compares possible courses of action to resolve a transportation issue using one or more criteria or factors. ISTEA requires alternatives analysis at the major investment study (MIS) level of project development. NEPA requires such analysis in the environmental impact statement (EIS) or environmental assessment (EA) process. The process by which possible solutions are compared, including the criteria employed, the measures of the criteria applied, and the results of the comparison presented, has substantial impact on the quality of the ultimate project selection. In fact, such alternatives analysis is usually the bridge between the technical project aspects and political decision making.
Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	The primary product of implementing a TDM program should be reduced peak period traffic congestion and air pollution. TDM programs include a variety of employer-provided incentives aimed at inducing commuters to rideshare, use transit, walk, or bicycle to work. Incentives include preferential parking, matching services, bicycle facilities, and award programs.
Transportation Facilities	Individual modal or multimodal conveyances and terminals such as airports (terminals, flight zone); highways (roadways, rights of way, grade separations, bridges); rail (terminals, freight yards); waterways (ports, harbor); transit stations; and bicycle paths.
Transportation Services	Refer to the form of transporting goods or people: aviation, automobile, small truck, bicycle, transit (bus, van), large truck (freight), rail, barge, and ferry.

**Transportation Systems
Management (TSM)**

Cooperative development and implementation of strategies to maximize the safe movement of people and goods by managing an integrated multimodal transportation system. The effective management of the system will enable the traveling public more efficient use of the existing transportation facilities. Elements of TSM include incident management programs, traveler information systems, traffic signal systems upgrades, intermodal freight planning, surveillance control systems, demand management techniques, and commercial vehicle operations.